DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 753 EC 301 499

AUTHOR	Hales, Rene M.; Carlson, Laurance B.
TITLE	Issues and Trends in Special Education.
INSTITUTION	Federal Resource Center for Special Education, Lexington, KY.
SPONS AGENCY	Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	92
CONTRACT	HS91004001
NOTE	125p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Clearing House of Rehabilitation Training Materials (NCHRTM), Oklahoma State University, 816 W. 6th St., Stillwater, OK 74078-0435 ($6.75).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Cooperation; Computer Uses in Education; Curriculum; Delphi Technique; *Disabilities; Educational Policy; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *Futures (of Society); Instructional Effectiveness; Mainstreaming; Outcomes of Education; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Parent Participation; Program Costs; *Special Education; Special Needs Students; Student Evaluation; Teacher Supply and Demand; Transitional Programs; *Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

A total of 137 knowledgeable representatives in the field of special education (including federal, state, and local administrators; technical assistance providers; members of professional organizations; university professors; and selected private practitioners) used a modified Delphi process to respond to almost 200 statements concerning the future of special education. This report consists of a brief description of the process and respondents, a report of overall results, results in 14 topical domains, and a discussion of implications for the future. Overall trends include: critical shortages of special education personnel will occur at all levels, resulting in more important roles for paraprofessionals and provision of services for students with mild disabilities in the regular classroom; related services will continue to expand in type, quantity, and variety, creating a drain on resources; outcomes for students with severe disabilities will address functional life skills rather than isolated academic skills; and advances in technology will reduce functional limitations of persons with disabilities. Specific results are organized into the following 14 areas: assessment, curriculum and instruction, family involvement, finance, interagency coordination, least restrictive environment, personnel, policy and governance, reform and restructuring, research, service monitoring, societal values, technology, and transition from school to work. Appendices contain a statistical summary and a Delphi instrument used in soliciting the second round of responses. (JDD)

ED349753

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Issues and Trends in Special Education

Rene M. Hales
Laurance B. Carlson

Federal Resource Center for Special Education

Human Development Institute
An Interdisciplinary University Affiliated Program
at the
University of Kentucky

UK
1992

EC 301499

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Federal Resource Center Staff:

Laurance Carlson, Director
Rene Hales, Program Manager
Barbara Burcham, ADD Program Consultant
Sandra Challman, Information Coordinator
Judy Collins, Secretary

Federal Resource Center for Special Education
314 Mineral Industries Building
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506-0051
(606)257-1337

Office of Special Education Programs:

Marie Roane, Contracting Officer's Technical Representative
Department of Education 330 C Street SW
Mary Switzer Building, Room 4623
Washington, DC 20202

Printed on recycled paper

The Federal Resource Center for Special Education at the University of Kentucky is funded by the Office of Special Education Programs, US Department of Education through Contract #HS91004001. The contents of this report do not necessarily represent the opinions of the Department of Education or the University and the reader should not assume endorsement by the federal government of any products or organizations mentioned herein.

Acknowledgments

This report is based on responses from 137 representatives of the field of special education who thoughtfully reacted to the almost 200 predictive statements and comments of their peers. In addition, ten members of this group contributed by serving in the pilot round as reviewers of the data collection process and instrument. They provided many helpful suggestions to improve the instructions and clarify the actual predictive statements. Included in this group were A. Edward Blackhurst, Eugene Edgar, James J. Gallagher, Gladys Clark-Johnson, M. C. Martinson, Debra Spotts Merchant, Ken Olsen, Judy Smith-Davis, and Jo Thomason.

James Wolf, University of Kentucky Survey Research, and his staff analyzed data from both rounds. Jim also provided helpful suggestions on instrument development and data collection. A. Edward Blackhurst gave considerable additional assistance on survey methodology and uses of the Delphi process in the field of special education. His suggestions streamlined the process and increased responsiveness.

Development of the final report was the responsibility of Federal Resource Center staff. Rene Hales served as manager of the process and first author. Laurance Carlson was second author on the manuscript; Barbara Burcham assisted in contacting respondents and provided ongoing encouragement for the effort; guidance and suggestions for editing and formatting was given by Sandra Challman; and Judy Collins assisted throughout with data entry, mailing, and communication with field representatives.

Developing the process and writing the report was a rewarding task. It is hoped that the final product will encourage continued thoughtful consideration of the future of special education and positively affect services for children and youth with disabilities and their families.

Special Education: A Predicted Future

The future exists today in the form of our children.
Margaret Mead

What is the future of special education as we move into the 21st century? In order to answer this question, the Federal Resource Center queried knowledgeable representatives of the field including federal, state, and local administrators, technical assistance providers, members of professional organizations, university professors, and selected private practitioners (e.g., advocates, and national education project representatives). A modified Delphi process was used to get reactions to almost 200 predictive statements. Predicted trends impacting special education over the next 20 years are reported below based on mean likelihood ratings.

Overall Trends

- There will be critical shortages of special education personnel at all levels (teachers, administrators, and ancillary personnel). In an effort to deal with these personnel shortages, paraprofessionals will have an increasingly more important role in service delivery and will provide more direct instruction. Also, in an effort to meet the need for services, regular educators will be trained and acquire the skills necessary to serve students with mild disabilities thus blurring the borderline between special and regular education.
- Related services will continue to expand in type, quantity, and variety, creating a drain on resources. This coupled with the ambiguity among medical, related services, and instructional services will have an increasing fiscal impact on the system.
- Increased longevity will create expanded services for older citizens with disabilities. Outcomes for students with more severe disabilities will address functional life skills rather than isolated academic skills. High school diplomas or certificates of completion will be awarded to students with disabilities who satisfactorily complete their IEP goals.
- Advances in technology will substantially reduce functional limitations of persons with disabilities.

Assessment

- There will be a move toward more authentic assessment of abilities; not limited to pencil-and-paper tests.
- Prereferral and referral strategies will continue to be used to ensure that only students with disabilities are served in special education programs.

Curriculum and Instruction

- Instruction of children and youth with disabilities will occur in natural environments, and content will focus on individualized instructional objectives rather than the student's particular diagnosed disability.
- The use of cooperative leaning approaches for students with and without disabilities will become standard practice.
- As appropriate, students with disabilities will be included on IEP development teams to represent their own interests and desires for educational services.

Family Involvement

- Parents will play a more significant role in the special education decision making process, and school systems will adopt numerous nontraditional methods for involving parents in their children's special education program.

Finance

- States will cut special education funding as more students are served in regular education.
- Funding for assistive technology will increase and come from a variety of funding sources.

Interagency Coordination

- Community agencies will deliver their services in local neighborhoods, and when multiple agencies provide services for a child or family, a single plan will be developed involving all caregivers.

Least Restrictive Environment

- Children with mild disabilities will be served in the general classroom as an alternative to pull-out programs such as resource room configurations, and children and youth with severe and low incidence disabilities will be served in inclusive schools.

Personnel

- Children with severe disabilities needing special education services will more than double due to increased social problems, drug exposure, AIDs infections, and medical and technological advances. Due to this increased demand for services and growing personnel shortages, states will implement alternative routes to special education certification.

Policy and Governance

- Federal and state regulations will be reworked in IDEA and Chapter I to allow for the blending of special education and Chapter I funding and instruction.

- Policy changes will occur to make health care universally available for families of young children with disabilities.

Reform and Restructuring

- Special education will function as a support to regular education programs and personnel, rather than as an alternative education for learners with disabilities. Team teaching with special and regular educators in the classroom working together will be prevalent.

- The educational system will become more able to fully utilize the techniques, expertise, and specialized knowledge of the field of special education, and services for students with disabilities will become the joint responsibility of special and regular educators.

Research

- Increased research efforts will focus on early identification and diagnosis of emotional problems in infants and toddlers.

- There will be significant growth in research that focuses on the cost effectiveness and efficacy of various instructional strategies in educating children and youth with disabilities.

Service Monitoring

- Outcome measures for special education services will be better defined thus enhancing their use for teacher and school system evaluation, and states will expand follow-up data collection efforts in order to monitor the effectiveness of special education.

- Special education will be held accountable for a high level of quality in programs for students with exceptional needs and improved outcomes resulting from services provided.

- Federal monitoring will be increasingly focused on the state's ability to carry out the monitoring of the delivery of special education services by local agencies and state operated facilities.

Societal Values

- There will be increased knowledge and understanding of the contributions persons with disabilities can realistically make to society, and their potential economic contributions will be valued by policy-makers.

- Special education professionals will become sensitive to specific learning and interpersonal styles of children with disabilities from diverse cultural, racial, linguistic, and ethnic backgrounds and adapt their service delivery approaches accordingly.

Technology

- Technological advances in information storage and retrieval will enable parents and educators to access one data source about services and materials needed to serve individuals with disabilities.

Transition from School to Work

- An emphasis on life-long learning and employment will force greater integration of services between schools and human service agencies for people with disabilities 18 years and beyond.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Special Education: A Predicted Future i
    Overall Trends i
    Assessment ii
    Curriculum and Instruction ii
    Family Involvement ii
    Finance ii
    Interagency Coordination ii
    Least Restrictive Environment iii
    Personnel iii
    Policy and Governance iii
    Reform and Restructuring iii
    Research iii
    Service Monitoring iv
    Societal Values iv
    Technology iv
    Transition from School to Work iv
Introduction 1
        Purpose 1
        FRC Follow-up Activities 1
Procedures 2
    Method 2
    Sample 2
        Recruitment Process 2
    Delphi Instrument 5
        Definition of Terms 6
    Orientation 6
Results: Round II 7
    Overall Results 7
        High Likelihood Items 7
        High Desirability Items 10
        High Desirability-Likelihood Discrepancies 13
        High Likelihood-Desirability Discrepancies 15
    Convergence on Likelihood-Desirability Items 17
    Item Variability 18
    New Items 19
    Topical Results 20
        Assessment 20
        Curriculum and Instruction 21
        Family Involvement 21
            Decision-making 22
            Service models. 22
            Parent training 23

Finance 23
Interagency Coordination 24
Least Restrictive Environment 25
Personnel 25
Policy and Governance 26
Reform and Restructuring 26
Research 27
Service Monitoring 28
  Outcomes 28
  Accountability 28
Societal Values 29
Technology 30
Transition from School to Work 30
Discussion and Implications 31
References 35
Appendix A: Statistical Summary 37
Appendix B: Round II Delphi Instrument 45

TABLES

Table 1: Recruitment Results by Group 3
Table 2: Round I and Round II Respondents by Group 4
Table 3: Percentage of Total Respondents by Group 5
Table 4: Ranked High Likelihood Items 9
Table 5: Ranked High Desirability Items 11
Table 6: Item Desirability-Likelihood Discrepancies 14
Table 7: Item Likelihood-Desirability Discrepancies 16
Table 8: Items with Larger SDs on Round II 17
Table 9: Items with SDs > 1.5 on Round II 18

Introduction

As a part of the Federal Resource Center (FRC) Task 3 objectives, the Center sought input from identified experts in the field of special education to develop a report of issues and trends. Representatives from the field were asked to share their perspectives on the future of educational services for students with disabilities through a modified Delphi process.

The report consists of a brief description of the process and respondents, followed by an overall report of results, as well as results in 14 topical domains covered by the instrument. Next, a discussion and implications for the future are provided followed by selected appendices. Appendix A gives a complete listing of data including number of respondents, mean, median, standard deviation scores, and range for each item on likelihood and desirability for Round II. Finally, the Round II instrument including comments from Round I is provided in Appendix B.

Purpose

This Task 3 activity was undertaken to assist the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in developing a systematic method for identifying critical issues and trends related to providing quality educational programs that ensure a free appropriate public education and improved outcomes for children and youth with disabilities. It is anticipated that accurate and early identification of trends would allow the OSEP to be more efficient since constructive and proactive responses often require long lead times, especially where new policies, procedures, and methods are required (Teige, Harman, & Schwartz, 1977).

FRC Follow-up Activities

The FRC Task 3 includes three major objectives for providing assistance to the OSEP. This report is a part of but one of the objectives designed to facilitate long-range planning and thus enhance the consistency of technical assistance content and strategies. Follow-up activities will include the development of issue briefs or papers and small group meetings to address the identified issues.

Procedures

Method

A modified Delphi technique (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963; Delbecq, Van de Ven, & Gustafson, 1975) was employed to identify the issues and trends in special education. This method attempts to arrive at a forecast by generating a consensus about the shape of the future as perceived by those who will play a role in shaping it. The Delphi process involves soliciting opinions from well-informed individuals through several rounds of structured input. This method avoids problematic aspects of face-to-face decision making, such as the strong biasing influences of individual personalities on the judgments of others. Other strengths of the Delphi techniques are that (a) participants need not be in the same geographic location to participate in the process, (b) feedback to participants can be controlled, and (c) statistical analysis of the responses is possible.

The Delphi technique has been used successfully in the past by Reynolds (1973) as part of the Council for Exceptional Children's project on Professional Standards and Guidelines and by Putnam and Bruininks (1986) for the purpose of clarifying major issues and identifying trends in deinstitutionalization and education. The methodology used by Reynolds (1973) provided considerable guidance for the FRC investigation.

The FRC employed an iterative process consisting of one pilot and two subsequent rounds to obtain the results included in this report. The process took approximately 15 months to complete and involved over 250 field experts from a broad-base of educational levels.

Sample

Recruitment Process

Potential respondents were selected by FRC staff to be representative of the following seven groups: federal administrators, state and local education agency administrators, representatives of professional organizations, OSEP-funded technical assistance providers, higher education faculty, and others. The "others" category consisted of anyone not included in one of the first six categories and was made up of representatives from many professions, such as, private consultants, staff of Regional Education Laboratories, advocates, etc. In addition to these broad categories, efforts were made to include parents, consumers, and those with expertise in meeting the educational needs of students from diverse cultural, racial, linguistic, and ethnic backgrounds. In all 254 persons were selected for inclusion in the Delphi process. The potential respondents were sent a letter of recruitment that described the activity and the commitment required of participants. One hundred thirty-seven (53.94%) agreed to participate.

The results of the recruitment process are shown in Table 1. The table includes the number recruited by participant group, responses returned and their percent of the total, number of respondents agreeing to participate, and the percent of participants that committed to completing the process. OSEP-funded technical assistance providers had the highest percent of commitment to participation while those labeled "other" had the lowest. Over half (53.94%) of all potential participants agreed to complete two rounds of the Delphi instrument on issues and trends in special education.

Table 1

Recruitment Results by Group

Group	N Recruited	N Returned	% Returned	N Agreeing	% Agreeing
Federal administrators	11	10	90.91%	5	45.45%
State administrators	66	46	69.70%	32	48.48%
Local administrators	62	48	77.42%	40	64.52%
Professional organization representatives	26	20	76.92%	14	53.85%
OSEP-funded technical assistance project representatives	29	21	72.41%	20	68.97%
Representatives of IHEs	37	33	89.19%	19	51.35%
Others	23	13	56.52%	7	30.43%
Total	254	191	75.20%	137	53.94%

Two rounds of information gathering were conducted between December 1991 and June 1992. Respondents by group are reported for both rounds in Table 2. This table includes the number of instruments sent, number returned, and percent returned for each round. The last column shows the percent of potential return by group for the entire process. In Round I over 85% of the 137 respondents returned a completed form; 94 completed both rounds of the Delphi process. Rate of return for all groups was considered excellent; ranging from a low in the first round of 71.43% for others to a high of 100% for federal administrators in the second round. Percent of potential return for the entire process was 68.61% ranging from a low of 57.14% for both others and professional organization representatives to a high of 80% for federal administrators and OSEP-funded technical assistance project representatives.

Table 2
Round I and Round II Respondents by Group

	Round I			Round II			Both Rounds
Group	N Sent	N Returned	% Returned	N Sent	N Returned	% Returned	% of Potential Return
Federal administrators	5	4	80.00%	4	4	100.00%	80.00%
State administrators	32	29	90.63%	29	21	72.41%	65.63%
Local administrators/ educators	40	33	82.50%	33	27	81.82%	67.5%
Professional organization representatives	14	11	78.57%	11	8	72.73%	57.14%
OSEP-funded technical assistance project representatives	20	18	90.00%	18	16	88.89%	80.00%
Representatives of IHEs	19	17	89.47%	17	14	82.35%	73.68%
Others	7	5	71.43%	5	4	80.00%	57.14%
Total	137	117	85.40%	117	94	80.34%	68.61%

Table 3 provides a breakdown of groups by percent of total respondents for both rounds. Local administrators made up the largest percent of the total in both rounds; 28.21% in the first round and 28.72% in the second round. Percent of the total remained relatively stable for all groups over both rounds.

Table 3
Percentage of Total Respondents by Group

	Round I		Round II	
Group	N Returned	% of Total Returned	N Returned	% of Total Returned
Local administrators/ educators	33	28.21%	27	28.72%
State administrators	29	24.79%	21	22.34%
OSEP-funded technical assistance project representatives	18	15.38%	16	17.02%
Representatives of IHEs	17	14.53%	14	14.89%
Professional organization representatives	11	9.40%	8	8.51%
Federal administrators	4	3.42%	4	4.26%
Others	5	4.27%	4	4.26%
Total	117	100%	94	100%

Delphi Instrument

The Federal Resource Center staff conducted a review of special education literature, obtained needs assessment reports from the six Regional Resource Centers (RRCs), and solicited federal monitoring reports from the OSEP. These three sources were used to develop the initial predictive statements for the pilot round of the issues and trends instrument. The Round I instrument consisted of 146 items.

Ten of the original 254 member pool of identified national experts were recruited to review the instrument and respond to the pilot round. The instrument was revised based on pilot round input and mailed to the 137 participants. Respondents were asked to project the likelihood over the next 20 years of all predictive statements. They also were asked to rate the statements on their desirability, make comments on the items, and add additional predictive statements for the next round. One hundred fifteen completed responses were returned in time to be included in the initial data analysis (117 total were eventually received). Comments on items in Round I and 41 new predictive statements (labeled with N and a number) suggested by respondents were included in the Round II instrument. A few items were edited by FRC staff based on the comments by participants and one item was deleted as it was considered by respondents to be redundant. (See Appendix B for a copy of the Round II instrument.)

Definition of Terms

The following terms and definitions are used to categorize level of likelihood and desirability:

Values observed	"Likelihood" terms	"Desirability" terms
6 - 7	Very likely	Highly desirable
5 - 5.99	Likely	Desirable
4.5 - 4.99	Somewhat likely	Somewhat desirable
3.5 - 4.49	Noncommitted	Noncommitted
3 - 3.49	Somewhat unlikely	Somewhat undesirable
2 - 2.99	Unlikely	Undesirable
1 - 1.99	Very unlikely	Very undesirable

The measure of dispersion of responses is the standard deviation. In looking at differences of opinion or dispersion among individual responses, the following conventions are used:

Standard Deviation	Descriptor
Above 1.5	Greatly variable
1.0 to 1.5	Quite variable
.50 to .99	Slight variation
Below .50	Good agreement

Orientation

The entire Delphi process conducted by the FRC was oriented to the future. It was not meant to provide a picture of areas of consensus, but to give a prediction of what the field of special education might look like 20 years in the future. An overall picture is provided by describing the results in terms of high likelihood and desirability items and discrepancies between likelihood and desirability. In addition, results for 14 topical domains are summarized. These domains include the following arranged in alphabetical order:

- Assessment
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Family Involvement
- Finance
- Interagency Coordination
- Least Restrictive Environment
- Personnel
- Policy and Governance
- Reform and Restructuring
- Research
- Service Monitoring
- Societal Values
- Technology
- Transition from School to Work

Results: Round II

Overall Results

In order to provide an analysis of the results from Round II, first, findings across all items will be discussed under the four classifications listed below. Then results in the 14 topical domains will be presented.

- Items showing highest likelihood.
- Items showing highest desirability.
- Items showing highest desirability-likelihood discrepancy (D>L).
- Items showing highest likelihood-desirability discrepancy (L>D).

High Likelihood Items

Table 4 provides predictions by participants on the top 15 ranked items of what is likely to happen in special education over the next 20 years. Good agreement (SD < .50) was not achieved on any of the predictive statements. In fact only half of the items in the top 15 were in the slight variation range (SD .50 - .99) Respondents agreed most on Item 59–expansion of services for older citizens with disabilities.

Within the next 20 years according to respondents, paraprofessionals will play an increasingly more important role in providing direct services to students with disabilities. Related service costs will increase significantly and have increasing fiscal implications. In addition, these services will expand and providers of related services (e.g., OTs, PTs, psychologists, etc.) will be in such short supply that there will be a crisis in service delivery. This same lack of certified personnel will also be felt in the teacher ranks.

Respondents predict that the boundary between special and regular education will become increasingly obscured with regular educators receiving training to enhance their ability to serve students with mild disabilities. Expanded services will be provided for older citizens with disabilities while technological advances will substantially reduce functional limitations for those with disabilities. For students with more severe disabilities, outcomes will be focused on functional skills; assessment will move away from pencil-and-paper methods; and meeting objectives on IEPs will be used as one criteria for acceptable high school completion.

The 15 items rated highest on likelihood are listed and characterized briefly in Table 4. The likelihood rank is provided in the first column. The item number is shown in the next column (new item numbers preceded by N) and number of respondents is reported in column three. The mean likelihood is listed in the fourth column, followed by a brief statement of the item content in column five. Mean scores on likelihood range from 5.56 to 6.34. Only two items were judged to be very likely to occur; receiving a mean score greater than 5.99. The 13 other high likelihood items were judged to be likely (5.00 - 5.99).

Table 4
Round II: Ranked High Likelihood Items

Rank	Item #	N	Mean L	Brief Statement of Item
1	N19	89	6.34	Paraprofessionals will have an increasingly important role in service delivery.
2	N40	91	6.00	Costs for related services will increase significantly.
3	N41	87	5.98	The ambiguity among, medical, related services, and instructional services will have increasing fiscal implications.
4	N6	92	5.95	"Related services" will continue to expand in type, quantity, and variety creating a drain on funding resources.
5	N39	91	5.84	Related service [personnel] shortages will increase significantly.
6	N14	94	5.81	The shortage of special education teachers and therapists (OT, PT, psychologists, etc.) will reach a crisis level.
6	59	94	5.81	Increased longevity will create expanded services for older citizens with disabilities.
8	29	93	5.74	Outcomes for students with more severe disabilities in special education will address functional life skills, rather than isolated academic skills.
8	N32	91	5.74	Paraprofessionals will assume a more direct role in the instruction of children with disabilities.
10	N37	90	5.73	The borderline between special and regular education's responsibilities will become increasingly obscure.
11	91	92	5.72	High school diplomas or certificates of completion will be awarded to students with disabilities who satisfactorily complete their IEP goals in the 12th grade or at age 21.
12	112	92	5.67	There will be an insufficient number of certified special educators.
13	90	94	5.66	Advances in technology will substantially reduce functional limitations of persons with disabilities.
14	N29	94	5.63	Training of regular educators will expand to include skills necessary to serve students with **mild** disabilities.
15	47	93	5.56	There will be a move toward assessment of abilities that are not simply pencil-and-paper tests.

High Desirability Items

The 28 items receiving the highest desirability ratings are shown in Table 5. These items represent what respondents would *like* to see happen in special education over the next 20 years. Twenty-eight items are included in this listing since there was little difference (.04 to .01) in item means and all are greater than 6.49.

A discussion of the top ten items is provided; readers are referred to the table for a brief statement of the other 18 items. There was good agreement by respondents on the desirability of the top six items with standard deviations ranging from 0.18 for Item 33 to 0.47 for Item 126.

It would appear that a very highly desirable world for persons with disabilities as judged by the respondents would include virtually no discrimination in employment, public agency services, accommodations, and access to communication services. In this vision of the world, the public would understand and acknowledge the contributions that individuals with disabilities can make to society. Regular educators would understand and accept their role in serving children and youth with mild disabilities and training would include skills necessary to serve these students. In addition, preparation for all education majors would include training in special education.

Resources would be available to provide early intervention services, the gap between high school completion rates of students with disabilities and students without disabilities would be reduced, and a coordinated system of services would replace the current fragmented service delivery system. Access to life-long learning opportunities would be available; technological advances would substantially reduce functional limitations; and health care would be universally available.

As stated earlier, the differences between mean scores on the high desirability items are so small that readers are encouraged to take note of the full list of 28 items in Table 5 to get a complete picture of the world respondents envision as desirable for individuals with disabilities. In the table, rank is provided in column one, followed by item number, number of respondents, and mean desirability rating.

Table 5
Round II: Ranked High Desirability Items

Rank	Item #	N	Mean D	Brief Statement of Item
1	33	92	6.97	Discrimination on the basis of disability will be virtually eliminated.
2	N15	92	6.91	Knowledge and understanding of the contributions persons with disabilities can make to society will increase.
3	N29	94	6.90	Training of regular educators will include skills necessary to serve students with **mild** disabilities.
4	N9	93	6.87	Higher education will include special education training for **all** education majors.
5	N2	93	6.84	Regular education will understand and accept their role in serving children and youth with **mild** disabilities.
6	126	92	6.77	States will be able to appropriate sufficient resources to make early intervention services available.
7	30	93	6.73	The gap between high school completion rates of students with disabilities and rates for non-disabled students will be reduced.
8	96	93	6.72	The fragmented services provided by different agencies will be transformed into a coordinated system designed to meet the needs of children and youth with disabilities.
8	106	93	6.72	Access to life-long learning opportunities will be available.
10	90	94	6.71	Advances in technology will substantially reduce functional limitations of persons with disabilities.
10	95	93	6.71	Health care will be made universally available.
12	N8	92	6.68	Special education services for students with disabilities will be the joint responsibility of special and regular education.
12	32	91	6.68	Special education professionals will be sensitive to learning and interpersonal styles of children with disabilities from diverse cultural, racial, linguistic, and ethnic backgrounds.
14	39	93	6.67	Adult service programs will be expanded to fully meet the needs of students with disabilities exiting school programs.
15	80	94	6.65	As a result of advances in assistive technology, employment options for persons with disabilities will increase significantly.

Table 5

Round II: Ranked High Desirability Items (Continued)

Rank	Item #	N	Mean D	Brief Statement of Item
16	139	92	6.64	Equitable residential, social, and community options will become available to virtually all individuals with disabilities.
16	N37	92	6.64	The borderline between special and regular education's responsibilities will become obscure.
18	N25	85	6.62	Teacher certification will equate to teacher skill.
19	131	93	6.61	Statutory and fiscal reform will occur and drastically reduce interagency barriers and constraints to transition from school to work.
20	N20	93	6.59	Vo-tech and community colleges will become community service centers.
20	85	93	6.59	Life-long learning and employment will bring about integration of services between schools and human service agencies.
22	N18	91	6.58	Team teaching with special and regular education in the classroom will be prevalent.
23	47	93	6.57	There will be a move toward assessment of abilities that are not simply pencil-and-paper tests.
24	127	93	6.53	As appropriate, students with disabilities will be included on IEP development teams.
24	129	90	6.53	Funding models will support the provision of special education and other services in the neighborhood school.
26	61	92	6.52	Medical advances will prevent many disabilities.
26	62	94	6.52	The techniques, expertise, and specialized knowledge of special education will be more fully utilized by the regular education system.
28	16	94	6.51	The federal government will fund 40% of the extra costs associated with special education.
28	66	94	6.51	Mental health services will be integrated in the school setting and provide on-site support for children, parents and teachers.

High Desirability-Likelihood Discrepancies

Items in Table 6 are listed by rank according to what respondents would like to see happen, but did not see as likely to occur. These items could be interpreted as providing a potential action agenda for the special education field based on the discrepancy between desirability likelihood rating (D > L).

The most highly discrepant item is the desire for, but unlikelihood of, the federal government funding 40% of the extra costs associated with special education. Another quite discrepant item (#N25) is concerned with teacher skill being equated with teacher certification. These two items were by far the most discrepant; 4.63 and 4.26 respectively.

Discrepancies for other items range from a low of 2.53 to a high of 3.65 and include the delivery of quality education consistent with state validated criteria and a decline in litigation. The respondents rating of the desirability of the decline in litigation was quite variable (SD = 1.23). Respondents acknowledged in their comments that litigation can be a force for positive change in the system as has been documented historically.

Three of the items with high desirability and low likelihood relate to fiscal issues. Respondents feel it is desirable for research and development funds in the *America 2000* plan to include special education as a priority; for states to appropriate sufficient resources to make early intervention services available; and that inclusive programs will generate increased funding. Issues related to cultural diversity were also highly ranked by respondents on desirability-likelihood discrepancies. The discrepancy between the number of teachers from minority groups and the students served needs to be reduced and special educators should reflect the cultural, racial, linguistic, and ethnic mix of the communities they serve.

In this potential agenda for special education, adult services need to be expanded to meet the needs of students exiting school programs, fragmented services need to be transformed into a coordinated system, and local school districts need to self-monitor to establish standards. Work also needs to be done to enable the regular education system to accept their role in providing services for children and youth with mild disabilities. The field heartily supports the intent of the *Americans with Disabilities Act* feeling that discrimination on the basis of disability needs to be eliminated and that equitable residential, social, and community options should be available to virtually all individuals with disabilities.

In the table, the rank is given in the first column, the item number is in the second column, the mean discrepancy is in column three, and a brief statement of the item is reported in the last column.

Table 6
Round II: Item Desirability-Likelihood Discrepancies

Rank	Item #	Mean D minus Mean L	Brief Statement of Item
1	16	4.63	The federal government will fund 40% of the extra costs associated with special education.
2	N25	4.26	Teacher certification will equate to teacher skill.
3	N26	3.65	Schools will be able to deliver quality education consistent with what the state has validated.
4	97	3.48	Special education litigation will decline.
5	19	3.38	Private sector funds for research and development in the *America 2000* plan will include special education as a priority.
6	126	3.35	States will be able to appropriate sufficient resources to make early intervention services available.
7	76	3.18	The discrepancy between the proportion of teachers and students served with diverse cultural backgrounds will decrease significantly.
8	39	3.14	Adult services will be expanded to fully meet the needs of students with disabilities exiting school programs.
9	139	3.13	Equitable residential, social, and community options will become available to virtually all individuals with disabilities.
10	N31	2.96	Inclusive programs will generate increased funding.
11	33	2.79	Discrimination on the basis of disability will be virtually eliminated.
12	31	2.71	Special education service providers will reflect the cultural, racial, linguistic, and ethnic mix of the community.
13	N4	2.61	Local school districts will self-monitor to establish standards.
14	N2	2.59	The regular education system will accept their role in serving children and youth with mild disabilities.
15	96	2.53	The fragmented services provided by different agencies will be transformed into a coordinated system designed to meet the needs of children and youth with disabilities.

High Likelihood-Desirability Discrepancies

Items in Table 7 present the inverse picture of Table 6. This is a listing of items that are judged by respondents to be most likely but least desirable (L > D). Again they are items for action since these are potential outcomes that the field would not like to see occur.

The 18 items with high likelihood and low desirability clustered primarily in two areas–*fiscal efforts* and *personnel issues.* Over the next 20 years, respondents feel the costs for related services will increase and create an undesirable drain on funding resources. The lack of distinction between medical, related services, and instructional services also will have adverse fiscal implications. Costs associated with special education will increase and a backlash reaction to special education expenditures will severely limit fiscal resources. Respondents predict that states will cut funding for special education, teacher preparation, and services for at-risk infants and toddlers.

In the personnel area, respondents feel it is undesirable, but likely that shortages of teachers, ancillary personnel providing related services, and administrators will reach crisis levels. There will not be a sufficient number of certified special educators and those entering college programs will be less qualified than in the past.

Respondents feel that students with severe disabilities will increase and that through reform efforts special education will become the general remedial arm of the education system. The remaining items with high likelihood and low desirability are concerned with increasing dropout rates and decreasing employment opportunities for students served in special education. In addition an increase in the mismatch between skills of graduates and the requirements of tomorrow's jobs will continue to widen. Those who made comments felt this mismatch in skills also would hold true for general education graduates. This premise is substantiated by Cetron and Gayle (1990) as one of the major overall trends facing public education.

In the table, item rank is reported in column one, item number is in column two, the difference between the mean likelihood score and the mean desirability score is in column three, and the predictive statement in a brief form is listed in column four.

Table 7
Round II: Item Likelihood-Desirability Discrepancies

Rank	Item #	Mean L minus Mean D	Brief Statement of Item
1	N40	4.72	Costs for related services will increase significantly.
2	N14	4.38	The shortage of special education teachers and therapists (OT, PT, psychologists, etc.) will reach a crisis level.
3	N39	4.33	Related service [personnel] shortages will increase significantly.
4	60	4.08	Children with severe disabilities will more than double.
5	112	4.03	There will be an insufficient number of certified special educators.
6	N6	3.39	"Related services" will continue to expand in type, quantity, and variety creating a drain on funding resources.
7	N41	3.37	The ambiguity among, medical, related services, and instructional services will have increasing fiscal implications.
8	74	3.30	A mismatch between graduate skills and requirements of tomorrow's jobs will continue to grow.
9	113	3.23	There will be an insufficient number of qualified special education administrators.
10	145	2.98	A backlash reaction to special education expenditures will severely limit fiscal resources.
11	41	2.95	Education and human services curricula will attract less qualified college entrants.
12	20	2.94	Budget and funding problems will reduce services to at-risk infants and toddlers.
13	146	2.81	The costs associated with special education will double.
14	75	2.62	The number of special education students dropping out of school will double.
15	N13	2.47	States will cut special education funding as more students are served in regular education.
16	55	2.25	Under "reform activities" special education will become the general remedial arm of the education system.
17	67	2.20	Employment opportunities for people with disabilities will decrease.
18	14	2.14	State funding for special education teacher preparation programs will be severely cut.

Convergence on Likelihood-Desirability Items

Since one of the features of the Delphi process is its potential for increasing consensus through the sharing of earlier results, the FRC looked at convergence trends on "likelihood" and "desirability" items. Convergence was shown when standard deviations on the seven-point scales decreased for Round II responses. Of the 146 items included in Rounds I and II, only one did not show convergence in likelihood; eight did not show convergence in desirability; and one item showed greater variability on both dimensions. The lack of convergence on both dimensions for this one item might have been due to editing and changing the time span from three-to-five years to from five-to-ten years. Respondents felt that this made correction of problems too long term. Items with lack of convergence are listed in Table 8.

Table 8
Items with Larger SDs on Round II

Dimensions	Item	Statement of Item
Both	9	The efficacy of special education services will be determined five to ten years after students leave school and will be based on outcomes in work, school, leisure, success in postsecondary education, and competitive employment.
Likelihood	76	The discrepancy between the proportion of teachers and students served with diverse cultural backgrounds will decrease significantly.
Desirability	24	Parents will participate as full decision making partners on policy issues at local and state levels.
	34	Federal monitoring will be increasingly focused on the state's ability to carry out the monitoring of the delivery of special education services by local agencies and state operated facilities.
	73	States will be required to develop new family-centered services, such as at-home crisis intervention and specially-trained foster families to meet the needs of children who are seriously emotionally disturbed.
	90	Advances in technology will substantially reduce functional limitations of persons with disabilities.
	95	Health care will be made universally available.
	128	Community service agencies (health care, mental health, social services) will deliver their services in neighborhoods.
	130	Transition and post school planning for students with disabilities will begin at the elementary level instead of during adolescence.
	139	Equitable residential, social, and community options will become available to virtually all individuals with disabilities.

Item Variability

Many items showed substantial variation on both likelihood and desirability. These items would appear to be those associated with the most controversy among respondents and the least consensus of opinion. These would be items for potential discussion of the varying view points they engender. Items showing great variability (SDs larger than 1.5) on Round II are listed in Table 9.

Table 9
Items with SDs > 1.5 on Round II

Dimensions	Item	Statement of Item
Likelihood Items:	N4	Local school districts will self-monitor to establish standards.
	N11	Mildly disabled students will be provided with increasing amounts of ancillary or related services (e.g., OT, PT, counseling, etc.).
	1	State run institutions serving individuals with **severe and low incidence** disabilities will be closed.
	N25	Teacher certification will equate to teacher skill.
Desirability Items:	N11	Mildly disabled students will be provided with increasing amounts of ancillary or related services (e.g., OT, PT, counseling, etc.).
	N38	OT and PT will no longer be legal guarantees of special education.
	N30	Special categorical funding will exist but only for certain categories of disability that are so low in prevalence they could be lost in the shuffle and lose big.
	N5	Public law 94-142 will be rewritten to take out legalized aspects.
	10	Special education services will be limited to meeting the needs of students with **moderate** to **severe** disabilities.
	N1	Private for profit group homes for children and youth with severe and low incidence disabilities will take the place of state institutions.
	92	Certificates of completion for students with disabilities not in the diploma track will be considered a satisfactory means of meeting the National Educational Goal of graduating at least 90 percent of high school students.
	1	State run institutions serving individuals with **severe and low incidence** disabilities will be closed.
	115	Parents will have the power to veto IEPs.

N10 Funding mechanisms will change to allow services for students with **mild** disabilities to become the exclusive responsibility of regular education.

118b Teachers (special and regular educators) will hire personnel to carry out administrative functions.

12 SEAs will contract with external agencies or businesses for full compliance monitoring services.

N31 Inclusive programs will generate increased funding.

77 States will implement alternative routes to special education certification as a solution to teacher shortages.

17 Management and funding for health and education services delivered to children and youth with disabilities will become consolidated under one **federal** department.

37 Parents of children with disabilities will have the right to exercise school choice and school systems will have to provide a free appropriate education at the school the parent has chosen.

72 Special education placement will be determined using computerized decision-making (expert) systems as an aid to placement teams.

26b Most children with **moderate** disabilities will be retained in the general classroom as an alternative to pull out programs such as self-contained and resource room configurations.

N32 Paraprofessionals will assume a more direct role in the instruction of children with disabilities.

New Items

Forty-one new items (labeled N) were submitted by Round I respondents for inclusion in the Round II instrument. Over one fourth of the new items (27%) focused on some aspect of the role or responsibility of regular educators in serving children and youth with disabilities. These ranged from a unitary education and training system to potential collaborative or team teaching roles regular and special educators could play in educating all children.

Another area generating a high number of new items was related services. Seven items were added–17% of the new items. These included shortages in personnel, increased costs, and lack of adequate funding. Indicators of high school completion also generated three new items. Respondents predicted that diplomas might be replaced by a competency list or documentation of learning experiences and performance of skills. Two items were added related to the future roles of paraprofessionals. Both of these items were rated among the 15 most likely to occur. High school completion and paraprofessional items made up seven and five percent of the new items respectively.

Topical Results

Predictive statements were sorted into topical areas by FRC staff. This categorization resulted in the identification of 14 topical domains covered in the Delphi process. They ranged in number from a high of 33 dealing with personnel issues to a low of four in the technology domain. Some items could have been included in more than one domain and decisions as to topical area pleacement were somewhat arbitrary. Results by domain are discussed below. Since all topics are considered important, they are reported alphabetically.

Assessment

Five predictive statements (46, 47, 50, 124, and 125) related to assessment issues were included in Round I of the Delphi process; one new item (N22) was added for Round II. Items in this domain focused on the use of assessment for eligibility and instructional planning.

Respondents felt it was highly desirable and likely that education move away from reliance on pencil-and-paper tests as measures of ability. Other highly desirable items (124 and 125) related to the use of testing for eligibility determination. Based on the ratings of these two items, respondents would like to see assessment focused more on instructional planning and be performance based rather than the current focus on eligibility determination and the use of discrepancy formulas. However, comments from both rounds acknowledged a need for both types of tests–determination of eligibility and ongoing assessment for instructional planning. Perhaps the current focus of testing is the issue, with it appearing that the preponderance of assessment resources are used to determine eligibility not plan instruction.

Respondents felt it was likely that there would be continuing emphasis on prereferral strategies, though this intervention should not act as a barrier or delaying tactic when students are eligible and in need of services. The one, new item predicted the use of curriculum-based assessment for determination of eligibility rather than standardized tests. This item was rated as desirable by respondents (Mean = 5.46) though likelihood fell in the noncommitted range. Comments on this item generally supported a desire for this type of assessment, though a move toward more authentic "standardized" models was considered a distinct possibility by one respondent.

Concern also was expressed about the ongoing need for ensuring that standardized tests be validated on the appropriate population.

Curriculum and Instruction

In the curriculum and instruction domain, respondents were asked to react to 11 items (28, 42, 53, 54, 79, 89, 127, 134, 135, 141, and 144) in Round I. A new item (N17) was added and item 134 was edited based on recommendations from participants and was split into items 134a and 134b for Round II. Another item was added in the second round; it predicted the use of Individual Family Service Plans for eligible children 3 through 5 years of age receiving special education services.

Predictions in this domain focused on what, where, and how instruction will occur and on the development and use of IEPs. Six of the items were in the highly desirable range. None of the items were rated as very likely though five fell in the likely range.

Respondents rated item 127 as the 24th most desirable, acknowledging that as appropriate, students with disabilities should be included on IEP development teams to represent their own interests. One respondent expressed the belief that students even at the elementary level should participate and have an opportunity to express their interest and desires. The IEP process was seen as an authentic means for becoming more self-directed and independent. Replacing IEPs with individual service plans developed by multiagency teams (141) was also rated as highly desirable. This statement suggested that the plan not only include skill/ instructional objectives, but incorporate community supports needed by the individual student and his or her family. A few respondents questioned whether schools would be the appropriate mechanism to bring this about.

Universal availability of vocational education for all youth with disabilities (79) was rated as highly desirable (Mean = 6.47). Other highly desirable items included instruction in natural environments (89) and the availability of alternative curriculum options (144). Respondents felt it was highly desirable for cooperative learning approaches to become standard practice for students with and without disabilities (Mean = 6.24). All of these highly desirable items had only slight variation in ratings.

Family Involvement

In the first round of the Delphi process, nine items (21, 24, 36, 37, 70, 73, 83, 114, and 115) were related to parent or family involvement in the education of children with disabilities. One new item (N16) was added and included in the second round. The items in this area focused on three distinct subtopics: decision-making, service delivery, and the training of parents.

Decision-making. Respondents found increased parental decision making both desirable and likely over the next 20 years. However, parental participation as policy makers was not as highly desirable or likely. Parents as primary determiners of placement and services was judged to be noncommitted on both likelihood and desirability. Respondents felt participation was important, but in a team context and not as primary determiners and a "meaningful role" was considered to be a more appropriate descriptor. An item dealing with IEP veto power for parents was somewhat undesirable and in the noncommitted range on likelihood. The likelihood rating was interesting since many comments stated parents already have this power. Another respondent expressed the view that decisions on placement should be made as a form of partnership between parents and the interdisciplinary team. An item dealing with school choice for parents of children with disabilities fell in the noncommitted range on both dimensions and was in the greatly variable range on desirability.

Comments on one item ranged all the way from the feeling that parents should be key decision makers, to the idea that parents are just too busy surviving to be worried about what is going on at school. Several respondents felt that parents would need training and that not all parents are in a position to make appropriate decisions for their children.

In conclusion, family involvement is highly desirable, but there is little consensus as to the level or role parents should play in the process. Based on respondent comments, team membership and involvement in decision making, but not in policy development, seem to be the more acceptable levels of participation. Technical assistance providers as a group appear to be somewhat more favorable than other respondents toward parents and students as primary determiners of placement and services, equating this with self-determination and empowerment principles.

Service models. Two items describing service delivery for families were rated as highly desirable. These items called for adopting nontraditional methods for involving parents in their children's special education program, and services oriented to family and child need and not toward disciplinary interests and service traditions. One item rated as desirable focused on the development of family centered services, such as at-home crisis intervention and specially-trained foster families to meet the needs of children who are seriously emotionally disturbed (SED).

Comments on these items supported the need for schools to do whatever was necessary to increase parental involvement. The item on SED services reflected the need for interagency coordination and involvement to bring this about. One responder felt this would not be accomplished as a state education initiative since it goes beyond the realm of educational issues and services. References were also made by respondents about larger societal issues that impact the family (e.g., underemployment, poverty, etc.). Item 83 was considered to be an indictment of the special education profession by one respondent–implying that the needs of the family and child are not treated with primary importance. Another respondent expressed the view that we put too much effort into preserving organizational control rather than liberating the field to try new directions.

Parent training. The item (21) on training of parents of children with disabilities by state departments of education was rated as desirable, but noncommitted in likelihood. This type of training was considered by some respondents as more appropriately the purview of the local education agency, with funds coming from the state level.

Finance

In the finance domain, 16 items (13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 22, 57, 58, 64, 98, 105, 126, 129, 138, 145, and 146) were included in the first round. Respondents added seven items (N6, N10, N13, N30, N31, N40, and N41) to be rated in Round II. The 2nd, 3rd, and 4th most likely items (N40, N41, and N6) were related to finance issues; three items from this domain were in the top 28 most desirable items (126, 129, and 16).

Eight of the items in this domain were among the top 18 in the likelihood-desirability discrepancy ratings. These included the prediction that; costs for related services will increase significantly (L>D rank 1); related services will continue to expand in type, quantity, and variety creating a drain on resources (L>D rank 6); the ambiguity among medical, related services, and instructional services will have increasing fiscal implications (L>D rank 7); and states will cut special education funding as more students are served in regular education (L>D rank 15). Respondents making comments generally agreed that the drain on fiscal resources would be undesirable, but that the appropriate services must be available. One respondent reported a trend toward the use of matrix organizations and a spreading of the responsibility/ cost liability across a number of service providers as a partial solution to these funding problems.

Other items that were rated likely but undesirable predicted that; resources will be severely limited due to a backlash reaction to special education expenditures (L>D rank 10; services for at-risk infants and toddlers will be reduced due to funding difficulties (L>D rank 12); costs associated with special education will double (L>D rank 13), and; state funding for special education teacher preparation programs will be severely cut (L>D rank 18).

Three highly desirable but unlikely items were also in this domain. They include the desire for the federal government to fund 40% of the extra costs associated with special education (D>L rank 1st); sufficient funding for providing early intervention services (D>L rank 6th); and that inclusive programs will generate increased funding. (D>L rank 10th). Respondents felt it was desirable that funding models support the provision of special education and other services in neighborhood schools, provide interaction with age appropriate peers and participation in the local community (ranked 24th).

Interagency Coordination

All five items (66, 86, 96, 128, and 131) related to interagency coordination were ranked in the highly desirable range by respondents to the Delphi process. In addition, there was only slight variation in consensus ratings (SD 0.62 to 0.76) for these items. However, none of these predictions were considered likely to occur. One new item was added in the second round and was not rated. The additional item predicted an increase in the development and use of local interagency coordinating councils to plan and coordinate special education and related services.

The 8th highest item in desirability and 15th on the desirability-likelihood discrepancy rankings predicted the transformation of currently fragmented services into a comprehensive, multidisciplinary, interagency system. This item would then be one that is seen as highly desirable, but not likely and could become part of an action agenda for the field. This is particularly true since there was only slight variation (SD = 0.65) on the desirability rating.

Two other items falling in the highly desirable range (ranked 19th and 28th) called for statutory and fiscal reform to drastically reduce interagency barriers and constraints in transition from school to work and the integration of mental health services into school settings. Respondent comments identified some of the barriers to interagency coordination that contributed to the low likelihood ratings as "turfism," "current funding systems," and "bureaucracy."

The remaining two items (86 and 128), that were also highly desirable but below a mean of 6.5, called for the development of a single service delivery plan even when multiple agencies were involved in service provision, and the delivery of services (health care, mental health, social services) in local neighborhoods. The definition of "neighborhoods" was considered problematic by some respondents particularly given the sparse population in some areas and lack of identifiable neighborhood boundaries in cities.

Least Restrictive Environment

In the first round of the Delphi process, four items (1, 2, 3, and 26) were included in the least restrictive environment domain. For the second round, one new item was added (N1). In addition, one item (26) was edited based on comments made by respondents and became items 26a and 26b in the second round.

Two items in this domain (2, and 26a) were rated as highly desirable. According to results, respondents want a full range of program options for students with severe and low incidence disabilities in neighborhood schools. Likelihood ratings on this item were quite variable (SD = 1.32) and its likelihood rating fell in the noncommitted range. Respondents also hoped that children with mild disabilities would be retained in the general classroom as an alternative to pull-out programs though there was little consensus on this item (SD = 1.13).

Two items (1 and N1) had great variability in ratings of desirability (SDs larger than 1.5). Item 1 was also greatly variable on likelihood ratings. These items dealt with the closing of state run institutions and the replacement of state run institutions by private, for-profit group homes to serve children and youth with severe and low incidence disabilities. There appears to be little agreement by the field in this area, at least on the statements developed by the FRC. Both of these items received many comments by respondents. Comments included the need for a "full continuum of services" and the possibility of "replacement of large institutions by small group homes . . . in communities."

Personnel

The personnel domain consisted of the most predictive items (27 31, 40, 41, 60, 65, 68, 76, 77, 99, 100, 103, 104, 109, 111, 112, 113, 116, 117, 118, 121,and 122); 22 in the first round and nine new items (N9, N19, N14, N25, N29, N32, N33, N35, and N39) in Round II. In addition two items were edited and became items 27b and 118b in the second round for a total of 33 items.

According to respondents, it is likely that paraprofessional will have an increasingly important role in service delivery (ranked 1st) and that they will play a more direct role in the instruction of children with disabilities (ranked 8th). It is both likely (ranked 14th) and desirable (ranked 3rd) that training of regular educators expand to include skills necessary to serve students with mild disabilities. The 4th most desirable item (N9) was also in the personnel domain and predicted that higher education will include special education as part of the preparation program for all education majors.

Three other items were rated as desirable, but not likely and were among the ranked items on the desirablility-likelihood discrepancy ratings. These included predictions that teacher certification will equate to teacher skill (ranked 2nd); that the discrepancy between the proportion of teachers providing services and students served with diverse cultural backgrounds will decrease significantly (ranked 7th); and that special education service providers will reflect the cultural, racial, linguistic, and ethnic mix of the communities they serve (ranked 12th).

Six items in this domain were considered by respondents to be likely, but not desirable and were ranked on the likelihood-desirability discrepancy ratings. These items predicted personnel shortages for teachers (ranked 2nd), related service providers (ranked 3rd), certified professionals (ranked 5th), and administrators (ranked 9th). In addition to these critical shortages in personnel, respondents also predicted that less qualified applicants will be attracted to education and human services preparation programs (ranked 11th)and that children with severe disabilities needing services will double (ranked 4th). It would appear that these critical shortages in personnel coupled with an increase in those requiring services and the lack of ability of future trainees will put a strain on the entire service delivery system.

Policy and Governance

The Delphi process included 11 first round items (17, 18, 38, 56, 81, 82, 95, 97, 101, 102, and 108) related to policy and governance of special education. Five new items (N3, N5, N11, N23, and N38) were added for second round ratings.

Item 95 was rated as the 10th most desirable. It predicted policy changes to make health care universally available for families of young children with disabilities. Three other items were also rated as highly desirable. These included the reworking of regulations in IDEA and Chapter I to allow for the blending of funding and instruction (N23); the reduction of grade retention in elementary and middle grades (108); and the decline of special education litigation (97). However, this last item was the 4th ranked item on the desirability-likelihood discrepancy rankings. Comments by respondents indicate that this item is only desirable if it occurs because the rights of individuals with disabilities are being upheld and appropriate services are available. In fact, the value of litigation as a means for effecting positive change was acknowledged by respondents.

Reform and Restructuring

In the first round, the reform and restructuring domain consisted of 16 items (10, 11, 19, 48, 49, 51, 52, 55, 62, 84, 107, 110, 119, 120, 142, and 143). Eight new items (N2, N7, N8, N12, N18, N34, N37, and N38) were added by respondents for Round II. One item (N37) was rated as the 10th most likely and five items were in the top 28 on desirability ratings. In addition, item N2 ranked 14th on desirability-likelihood discrepancy ratings and item 55 was 16th on the likelihood-desirability discrepancy ratings.

The 5th most desirable item (N2) in the Delphi process predicted that the regular education system would understand and accept their role in serving children and youth with mild disabilities. This item was not considered to be very likely to occur in fact it was 14th on desirability-likelihood discrepancy ratings. Based on comments, respondents felt this change could not occur unless there was a dramatic increase in training and collaboration between regular and special education.

Item 55 was ranked 16th on likelihood-desirability discrepancy ratings. Respondents felt it was likely, but not desirable, that as schools become more sensitized to the student who is not progressing under "reform activities," there would be growing pressure for special education to become the general remedial arm of the educational system. This is not the role respondents want to play. Respondents would like for special education services to be the joint responsibility of special and regular education and for the borderline between the two to become more obscure. Team teaching with special and regular educators in the classroom was highly desirable (ranked 22nd) and a codependency between the two systems where techniques, expertise, and specialized knowledge of special education are used by all (ranked 26th).

Research

The first round of the Delphi process, included seven items (25, 35, 61, 63, 69, 93, and 94) related to research. One new item (N24) was added. Two items were rated as highly desirable while three fell in the desirable range.

Respondents felt research (genetic engineering and other medical advances) and prevention of disabilities were highly desirable, but they feared that advances might not be available to all and, since more individuals with disabilities will be living longer, that the overall numbers of those needing services would not decrease. The other highly desirable item predicted increased research efforts on early identification and diagnosis of emotional problems in young children. However, those choosing to comment on this item were generally negative (e.g., "SED infants and toddlers?"). One respondent hoped that research in this area also would focus on ameliorating and preventing problems associated with emotional disturbance. This item's rating might be a reflection of the understanding by a majority of respondents that delayed intervention with this group of children is not generally effective. Interestingly this same item had the highest likelihood rating of any in the research domain (Mean = 5.02).

None of the items related to predicting the focus of research or methods for developing a research agenda fell in the highly desirable or likely range. In fact, most items in this domain were in the noncommitted range on likelihood.

Service Monitoring

Thirteen items (4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 29, 34, 71, 87, 88, 136, and 137) were included in Round I of the Delphi process in this domain. Two new items (N4 and N26) were added by respondents for inclusion in the second round. Two thirds of the items fell in the highly desirable range (Means from 6.01 to 6.46); item 29 was ranked as the 8th most likely by respondents. Items in this domain focused on two areas–outcomes and accountability.

Outcomes. Respondents felt it was likely (Mean = 5.74) that outcomes for students with disabilities will address life skills rather than isolated academic skills. This item (29) was also rated as the most desirable in this domain. A highly desirable future in service monitoring would include in addition to item 29, a better definition of outcome measures; the incorporation of outcome data collection within the total educational assessment effort–not separate from general education; expanded collection and use of follow-up data; and a shift from monitoring processes to the monitoring of outcomes. However respondents, who added written comments, felt that both of these factors (processes and outcomes) were important parts of a comprehensive monitoring system.

Accountability. Respondents felt that compliance, access, and inclusion would no longer be satisfactory measures of effectiveness, instead; special education would be held accountable for a high level of quality programs and improved outcomes resulting from services provided; schools would be able to deliver quality education consistent with what states have validated; and a single monitoring system would be developed for evaluating each special education student's progress across different service delivery systems. In addition, the efficacy of special education services would be determined five-to-ten years after students have left school and would be based on outcomes in work, leisure, postsecondary education, and competitive employment. This last item, concerned with when efficacy of services would be determined, decreased in consensus from Round I to Round II. This might be due in part to an editorial change in the timelines from three-to-five year in the first round to five-to-ten years in the second round. One respondent pointed out that while five years might be too short a time period for measuring successful adult integration, too many intervening variables come into play to confidently relate student success to the efficacy of special education services when the time is increased to ten years. It was also felt that problem identification and resolution might be delayed under this extended timeline. Other comments on this item were related to the difficulty and expense associated with collecting follow-up data.

Societal Values

In the societal values domain, six items (23, 32, 33, 123, 139, and 140) were included in round one. One new item (N15) was added for Round II reaction. Six of the seven items were rated as highly desirable and the other as desirable.

Elimination of discrimination in employment, in the provision of services by public agencies, in public accommodations, and in access to telecommunications on the basis of disability was the most highly desired item in the entire Delphi process. This item also had the highest level of agreement by the respondents, but the likelihood of achieving this was rated considerably less. In fact, this item was the 11th highest on desirability-likelihood discrepancy. Another highly desirable (ranked 16th) but not likely item (139) was very similar. It predicted the availability of equitable residential, social, and community life options for individuals with disabilities and ranked ninth on desirability-likelihood discrepancy ratings. The field strongly desires the elimination of discrimination but is pessimistic about achieving this degree of acceptance over the next 20 years.

The 2nd most highly desirable item (N15) expressed a hope for increased knowledge and understanding of the contributions persons with disabilities can make to society. This item also had good agreement (SD = 0.33) in ratings. The 12th most desirable item (32) focused on the need for special education professionals to be sensitive to specific learning and interpersonal styles of children with disabilities from diverse cultural, racial, linguistic, and ethnic backgrounds and adapt their service delivery approaches accordingly. Some respondents felt that special educators are somewhat more sensitive in this regard, but others observed that this is not the case and that all educators should develop this sensitivity. One respondent emphasized the belief that this change would not be likely unless preparation programs and those doing the preparation also changed.

Technology

Four items (72, 80, 90, and 133) related to technology issues were included in the Delphi process. Three of the four fell in the highly desirable range. Respondents felt it was highly desirable (ranked 10th) and likely (ranked 13th) that technology would substantially reduce functional limitations of persons with disabilities. Also highly desirable (ranked 15th) was the prediction that assistive technology would provide more employment options. Item 133 was rated as highly desirable (Mean = 6.34) though it was not in the top ranked items. This item predicted improved information storage and retrieval to enable parents and educators to access data about available services and materials to meet the needs of individuals with disabilities. This item was rated as somewhat likely to occur.

Item 72 predicting the use of expert systems as an aid to making placement decisions engendered much comment. These ranged from "feed the IQ in and print out the street address of the building" to "given the 50% error rate in LD placements the present system is inhumane and incompetent–we need all the help we can get." There was a great deal of sentiment expressed about keeping decisions in the hands of humans, not machines. This item was not judged to be likely even though two comments described the current availability of this technology.

Transition from School to Work

This topical domain, transition from school to work, included 15 items (30, 39, 43, 44, 45, 59, 67, 74, 75, 78, 85, 91, 106, 130, and 132) in Round I. Four new items (N20, N21, N27, and N28) were added for the second round of the Delphi process. Of the items in this domain, five ranked in the top 20 on desirability ratings and two were in the top 15 in likelihood. One item was 8th on the desirability-likelihood discrepancy ratings.

The most likely of the transition items predicted that increased longevity would demand the expansion of services and additional support for older citizens with disabilities (59) and ranked 6th. This item was also rated as highly desirable (Mean = 6.24) The 11th most likely item (91) predicted that high school diplomas or certificates of completion will be awarded to students with disabilities who satisfactorily complete their IEP goals in the 12th grade or at age 21.

Other highly desirable items were number 30 (ranked 7th), number 106 (ranked 8th) and numbers 85 and N20 tied for 20th. These items depict a desirable future where the gap between high school completion rates for students with disabilities and for non-disabled students will be reduced; access to life-long learning opportunities will be universally available; life-long learning and health services will be provided through vo-tech and community colleges; and one could expect greater integration of services between schools and human service agencies for people with disabilities 18 and older due to a greater emphasis on life-long learning and employment.

The 14th ranked item on desirability was not felt to be very likely. This item calls for the expansion of adult services to fully meet the needs of students with disabilities exiting school programs. Part of the pessimism about this item takes into consideration the lack of funding and the belief that our economy will not support this as an entitlement. Apparently respondents see expansion of services and support as likely, but not the availability or programs and services that fully meet the individual needs of those exiting school.

Discussion and Implications

Predicting the future is an essential activity since the future is shaped by our ideas. The future becomes our invention since it does not now exist (Cornish, 1977). In the process conducted by the FRC, representatives of the field of special education rated predictive statements on likelihood and desirability. So a Utopian future, as well as, a predicted future was derived from the results. Perhaps more importantly, the discrepancies between these two views of the future were explored as potential areas for action. As a result of this investigation, three major challenges emerged–personnel shortages, personnel training, and funding. These must be considered as we envision the future of special education.

First, we are faced with a lack of sufficient qualified personnel to fulfill instructional, support, and administrative functions necessary to providing a quality education to all students with disabilities and their families. New and more effective methods of recruiting professionals and retaining those we have must be developed. We must also develop better ways of accurately determining supply and demand. The FRC is currently collaborating with the OSEP to implement better methods of assessing shortages and developing a National Agenda in Personnel Preparation. This initiative not only focuses on the need for more and better trained personnel, but on the recruitment and training of individuals from culturally, racially, ethnically and linguistically diverse backgrounds to work at all levels in the educational system.

Several potential solutions to personnel shortages were predicted through the Delphi process. One projected enlarging the role paraprofessionals play to include direct instruction. Another potential solution predicted a blurring of the boundaries between special and regular education, with increased instructional responsibilities for the education of students with mild disabilities being fulfilled by general education. This might occur through more collaborative or team teaching configurations for service delivery. Finally, respondents predicted the implementation of alternative routes for certification of professionals

Secondly, these potential solutions to personnel shortages have serious implications for personnel preparation. If indeed the roles of paraprofessionals do expand, at issue is who will provide the training. This could become the responsibility of universities, community colleges, or public schools working collaboratively or separately. In addition to training paraprofessionals for their new roles, professional service providers' roles and responsibilities will change. They too will have to be trained in how to work effectively within this service delivery model.

Increasing the responsibilities and enlarging the role of general educators in instructing students with mild disabilities also will have implications for personnel preparation. Respondents felt regular and special educators would be working more closely through consultative or team teaching models. Preparation programs would need to incorporate these skills into existing or new courses and school systems would need to provide inservice training for current practitioners. Preservice training could continue to be provided in separate preparation tracts with all teachers taking courses from both areas or the specialized knowledge from both fields could be integrated into courses that prepare teachers to work with wide ranges of student need in inclusive classrooms. Respondents in this study felt that specialized skills would be shared across teacher preparation programs though the method for accomplishing this was not specified..

A third challenge to providing appropriate services to children and youth with disabilities is inadequate funding. It was predicted by respondents that students with more severe disabilities and the need for related services would increase while funding remains the same or decreases. Respondents were particularly concerned that this could reduce the availability of early intervention services. Special education would need to either use the funds available more effectively or increase funding sources. With the current economic situation and pessimism about economic recovery, additional funds from current sources does not seem likely in the short run. Participants in the Delphi process hoped that the national emphasis on education might provide additional funds for children with disabilities through some of the *America 2000* initiatives, but they did not see this as likely. The field will be challenged to develop strategies to increase the likelihood of this occurring. Another potential means of increasing the funding pool would be through increased interagency and program collaboration (e.g., special education and Chapter I). Respondents hoped that regulations would be reworked in these programs to allow a blending of funds and instructional services.

There are indeed challenges to be met in our field as we move into the 21st century. It will take creative and dedicated individuals to meet these challenges and improve our educational system for all students.

One respondent provided the following thoughtful comments that seem to aptly summarize the difficulties ahead: As I completed the survey instrument, I became aware of how much decisions are influenced not by what is possible or desirable but by power, control, and territoriality at all levels. In addition, I am concerned by the little spent on education in this country and the movement away from the human factor between teachers and students toward mechanical solutions. Politics involved at all levels and the glacial movement toward change in our educational system and agencies saddens me. We need experimental programs to demonstrate what works. Special education needs to become less special and **education** needs to become special for all children. We need one capable comprehensive instructional support system for **all** students.

These views seem to parallel, at least in part, Rodney King's lament and our most serious question for the future might be–Can we all work together?

References

Cetron, M. & Gayle, M. (1990). *Educational renaissance.* New York: St. Martin Press.

Cornish, E. (1977). *The study of the future.* Bethesda, MD: World Future Society.

Dalkey, N. C. & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental application of the Delphi method to the use of experts. *Management Science.*, 9, 458-467.

Delbecq, A. L., Van De Ven, A. H. & Gustafson, D. H. (1975). *Group techniques for program planning.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Mead, M., (1970). *Culture and commitment: A study of the generation gap.* New York: Doubleday.

Reynolds, M. (1973). *Delphi survey: A report of rounds I and II, Conducted for the Professional Standards and Guidelines Project.* Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Teige, P., Harman, W. & Schwartz, P. (1977). The problem of critical problem selection. In H. A. Linstone & W. H. Clive Simmons (Eds.), *Futures research: New Directions* (pp. 230-249). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Appendix A: Statistical Summary

Appendix A: Statistical Summary

Appendix B provides a summary data table for Round II results. The item number is listed in column one and the number (N) of usable responses is in columns two and seven. Item numbers preceded by the letter "N" indicate new items added by participants in Round I. These items were inserted as close in proximity as possible to where the originator listed them on the Round I instrument. Item numbers followed by an "a" or "b" indicate an item that was split into two separate items due to suggestions or lack of clarity as identified by Round I participants. The mean is reported in column three for likelihood and column eight for desirability. Column four is the standard deviation (SD) for likelihood and column nine the standard deviation for desirability. The median (Med) for likelihood is in column five and column ten for desirability; while the range for each item on likelihood and desirability is reported in columns six and eleven respectively.

Appendix A
Round II Results Summary

	Likelihood					Desirability				
Item	N	Mean	SD	Med	Range	N	Mean	SD	Med	Range
1	93	4.41	1.53	5.0	1 to 7	92	4.89	1.66	5.0	1 to 7
N1	93	4.54	1.42	5.0	1 to 7	93	3.66	1.67	4.0	1 to 7
2	93	4.45	1.32	5.0	2 to 7	93	6.37	0.93	7.0	2 to 7
3	93	4.73	1.16	5.0	2 to 7	93	5.78	1.28	6.0	1 to 7
N2	93	4.25	1.33	4.0	1 to 7	93	6.84	0.45	7.0	5 to 7
4	89	4.91	1.20	5.0	2 to 7	89	6.08	1.11	6.0	3 to 7
5	93	4.11	1.39	4.0	1 to 7	93	4.39	1.50	4.0	1 to 7
N3	92	4.45	1.32	4.0	1 to 7	92	4.57	1.48	5.0	1 to 7
6	Deleted					Deleted				
N4	89	2.94	1.58	3.0	1 to 7	89	5.55	1.45	6.0	1 to 7
N5	92	1.96	1.20	2.0	1 to 6	92	4.42	1.81	5.0	1 to 7
N6	92	5.95	1.13	6.0	1 to 7	91	2.56	1.42	2.0	1 to 7
7	94	5.30	1.17	5.0	2 to 7	94	6.35	0.85	7.0	2 to 7
8	94	4.41	1.36	4.0	1 to 7	94	6.16	1.27	7.0	1 to 7
9	94	4.11	1.29	4.0	1 to 7	94	6.01	1.19	6.0	1 to 7
10	93	3.96	1.40	4.0	1 to 7	93	4.30	1.75	5.0	1 to 7
N7	93	5.25	1.11	5.0	2 to 7	93	6.28	1.26	7.0	2 to 7
N8	92	5.15	0.98	5.0	3 to 7	92	6.68	0.91	7.0	1 to 7
11	94	4.39	1.25	5.0	1 to 7	94	5.47	1.44	6.0	1 to 7
N9	94	5.17	1.17	5.0	3 to 7	93	6.87	0.42	7.0	4 to 7
N10	94	4.84	1.36	5.0	1 to 7	94	5.90	1.59	7.0	1 to 7
N11	90	4.76	1.57	5.0	1 to 7	90	3.47	2.05	3.0	1 to 7
12	91	3.55	1.31	4.0	1 to 7	91	3.63	1.55	4.0	1 to 7
13	93	4.76	1.43	5.0	1 to 7	92	5.45	1.22	6.0	1 to 7
14	92	3.90	1.19	4.0	1 to 7	92	1.76	1.14	1.0	1 to 6
N12	93	4.67	1.13	5.0	2 to 7	93	6.29	1.12	7.0	2 to 7
15	94	4.72	1.24	5.0	1 to 7	94	6.37	0.85	7.0	2 to 7
N13	94	5.21	1.43	6.0	1 to 7	94	2.74	1.42	2.0	1 to 7
16	94	1.88	0.99	2.0	1 to 5	94	6.51	0.92	7.0	2 to 7

	Likelihood					Desirability				
Item	N	Mean	SD	Med	Range	N	Mean	SD	Med	Range
17	94	3.04	1.26	3.0	1 to 6	94	4.94	1.52	5.0	1 to 7
N14	94	5.81	1.40	6.0	1 to 7	94	1.43	1.14	1.0	1 to 7
18	94	3.50	1.38	3.5	1 to 7	94	4.80	1.43	5.0	1 to 7
19	94	2.60	1.15	2.0	1 to 6	94	5.98	1.32	6.0	1 to 7
20	93	4.40	1.30	4.0	1 to 7	93	1.46	0.85	1.0	1 to 7
21	93	4.25	1.38	4.0	1 to 7	93	5.90	1.10	6.0	2 to 7
22	93	5.14	1.09	5.0	2 to 7	92	6.32	0.90	7.0	2 to 7
23	91	4.71	1.23	5.0	2 to 7	91	6.44	0.86	7.0	2 to 7
N15	92	5.32	1.06	5.5	2 to 7	92	6.91	0.32	7.0	5 to 7
N16	90	3.97	1.46	4.0	1 to 7	90	6.39	1.24	7.0	1 to 7
24	93	3.95	1.18	4.0	1 to 7	93	5.96	1.21	6.0	1 to 7
25	89	4.26	1.06	4.0	2 to 7	89	5.60	1.14	6.0	2 to 7
26a	93	5.31	0.99	5.0	1 to 7	93	6.01	1.13	6.0	2 to 7
26b	92	3.96	1.22	4.0	1 to 7	92	5.13	1.51	5.5	1 to 7
27a	93	3.44	1.17	3.0	1 to 6	93	4.30	1.47	4.0	1 to 7
27b	91	5.30	1.10	6.0	2 to 7	91	5.89	1.21	6.0	2 to 7
28	93	4.78	0.97	5.0	2 to 7	93	5.12	1.16	5.0	2 to 7
N17	91	4.42	1.22	5.0	2 to 7	91	5.71	1.33	6.0	1 to 7
N18	91	5.05	1.07	5.0	1 to 7	91	6.58	0.82	7.0	3 to 7
29	93	5.74	0.86	6.0	3 to 7	93	6.46	0.85	7.0	2 to 7
30	93	4.66	0.95	5.0	3 to 7	93	6.73	0.53	7.0	4 to 7
31	92	3.68	1.17	4.0	1 to 6	92	6.39	0.91	7.0	2 to 7
32	90	4.72	0.94	5.0	2 to 6	91	6.68	0.76	7.0	1 to 7
33	92	4.18	1.19	4.0	1 to 6	92	6.97	0.18	7.0	6 to 7
34	90	5.17	0.94	5.0	2 to 7	90	5.51	1.22	6.0	2 to 7
35	92	4.16	0.98	4.0	1 to 6	92	5.15	1.31	5.0	1 to 7
36	92	5.16	0.83	5.0	3 to 7	92	6.33	0.71	6.0	4 to 7
37	93	4.15	1.17	4.0	1 to 7	93	4.45	1.52	4.0	1 to 7
38	93	4.12	1.20	4.0	1 to 7	93	5.82	0.94	6.0	4 to 7
39	94	3.53	1.19	4.0	1 to 6	93	6.67	0.56	7.0	5 to 7
40	94	5.45	1.04	6.0	2 to 7	94	5.27	1.37	5.5	2 to 7
N19	89	6.34	0.89	7.0	3 to 7	89	6.18	1.12	7.0	3 to 7
41	93	4.20	1.17	4.0	2 to 7	93	1.25	0.48	1.0	1 to 3
42	94	5.31	0.87	5.0	3 to 7	94	6.24	0.86	6.0	3 to 7
43	93	4.76	1.12	5.0	2 to 7	93	6.49	0.82	7.0	3 to 7

	Likelihood					Desirability				
Item	N	Mean	SD	Med	Range	N	Mean	SD	Med	Range
N20	93	5.30	1.07	6.0	2 to 7	93	6.59	0.73	7.0	4 to 7
44	94	4.72	1.15	5.0	1 to 7	94	6.12	1.25	6.5	2 to 7
45	94	4.33	1.21	4.0	1 to 7	94	5.83	1.09	6.0	2 to 7
N21	90	3.93	1.38	4.0	1 to 7	90	5.46	1.38	6.0	1 to 7
46	93	2.60	1.03	2.0	1 to 5	93	3.86	1.42	4.0	1 to 7
N22	93	4.33	1.30	4.0	1 to 7	93	5.46	1.36	6.0	1 to 7
47	93	5.56	0.80	6.0	3 to 7	93	6.57	0.68	7.0	4 to 7
48	92	4.92	1.14	5.0	1 to 7	92	5.18	1.28	5.0	1 to 7
49	93	5.09	1.00	5.0	2 to 7	93	5.23	1.22	5.0	1 to 7
50	92	5.45	0.88	6.0	2 to 7	92	5.82	1.18	6.0	2 to 7
51	93	3.95	1.20	4.0	1 to 6	93	6.15	1.09	6.0	1 to 7
52	94	4.88	1.00	5.0	1 to 6	94	5.17	1.49	5.0	1 to 7
53	92	5.10	0.89	5.0	3 to 7	92	5.89	1.01	6.0	4 to 7
54	92	3.88	0.97	4.0	1 to 6	92	3.99	1.46	4.0	1 to 7
55	91	4.65	1.05	5.0	2 to 7	91	2.40	1.20	2.0	1 to 6
56	93	4.27	1.27	4.0	1 to 6	93	5.44	1.36	6.0	1 to 7
N23	92	4.93	1.00	5.0	2 to 7	92	6.41	1.04	7.0	3 to 7
57	91	4.98	0.99	5.0	2 to 7	91	5.03	1.49	5.0	2 to 7
58	93	3.85	1.07	4.0	2 to 7	93	3.43	1.25	3.0	1 to 7
59	94	5.81	0.66	6.0	4 to 7	94	6.24	0.74	6.0	4 to 7
60	92	5.46	1.04	6.0	3 to 7	92	1.38	0.80	1.0	1 to 6
61	92	4.55	1.15	4.0	2 to 7	92	6.52	0.72	7.0	4 to 7
62	94	5.21	0.85	5.0	3 to 7	94	6.52	0.70	7.0	4 to 7
63	94	4.40	1.06	4.0	2 to 7	94	5.43	1.31	5.0	1 to 7
N24	91	4.23	1.11	4.0	2 to 7	90	4.20	1.38	4.0	1 to 7
64	92	4.80	1.05	5.0	2 to 7	92	6.17	1.00	6.0	2 to 7
65	93	4.56	1.29	5.0	1 to 7	93	6.20	1.00	6.0	1 to 7
N25	86	2.36	1.53	2.0	1 to 6	85	6.62	1.02	7.0	1 to 7
66	94	4.65	1.03	5.0	2 to 7	94	6.51	0.62	7.0	4 to 7
67	94	3.44	1.36	3.0	1 to 7	94	1.24	0.80	1.0	1 to 7
68	94	4.12	1.01	4.0	2 to 6	94	5.71	1.21	6.0	1 to 7
69	93	4.04	0.99	4.0	1 to 6	93	4.44	1.25	4.0	1 to 7
70	93	4.78	0.93	5.0	2 to 6	93	6.20	0.80	6.0	3 to 7
71	93	4.29	1.09	4.0	2 to 7	93	4.90	1.10	5.0	2 to 7
72	94	3.94	1.21	4.0	1 to 7	94	3.44	1.52	3.0	1 to 7
73	94	4.64	1.00	5.0	1 to 6	94	5.93	1.11	6.0	1 to 7

	Likelihood					Desirability				
Item	N	Mean	SD	Med	Range	N	Mean	SD	Med	Range
74	94	4.64	0.96	5.0	3 to 7	94	1.34	0.63	1.0	1 to 4
75	92	3.66	1.03	4.0	2 to 7	93	1.04	0.20	1.0	1 to 2
76	93	2.43	0.99	2.0	1 to 5	93	5.61	1.27	6.0	1 to 7
77	93	5.48	0.95	6.0	2 to 7	93	4.06	1.53	4.0	1 to 7
78	93	4.25	1.07	4.0	1 to 7	93	6.25	0.79	6.0	4 to 7
79	93	4.68	1.14	5.0	2 to 7	93	6.47	0.70	7.0	4 to 7
80	94	4.66	1.08	5.0	1 to 7	94	6.65	0.54	7.0	5 to 7
81	94	3.13	1.18	3.0	1 to 6	94	3.71	1.48	4.0	1 to 7
82	92	3.24	1.10	3.0	1 to 6	92	4.15	1.37	4.0	1 to 7
83	93	4.44	1.03	4.0	2 to 7	93	6.34	0.73	6.0	4 to 7
84	93	3.82	1.03	4.0	1 to 6	93	4.40	1.24	4.0	1 to 7
N26	85	2.66	1.33	3.0	1 to 6	85	6.31	1.09	7.0	3 to 7
85	93	5.24	0.85	5.0	3 to 7	93	6.59	0.61	7.0	4 to 7
86	93	4.74	1.07	5.0	1 to 7	93	6.47	0.72	7.0	4 to 7
87	94	3.95	1.09	4.0	1 to 6	94	6.05	0.88	6.0	4 to 7
88	94	5.07	0.94	5.0	2 to 7	94	6.38	0.82	7.0	2 to 7
89	92	5.34	0.80	5.0	3 to 7	92	6.42	0.67	7.0	4 to 7
90	94	5.66	0.85	6.0	3 to 7	94	6.71	0.65	7.0	4 to 7
91	92	5.72	0.96	6.0	2 to 7	92	5.97	1.16	6.0	1 to 7
92	91	4.86	1.12	5.0	2 to 7	91	4.30	1.67	4.0	1 to 7
N27	93	4.32	1.20	4.0	1 to 7	93	6.20	1.06	7.0	3 to 7
N28	92	4.49	1.14	5.0	1 to 7	92	5.91	1.16	6.0	2 to 7
93	94	4.89	0.97	5.0	2 to 7	94	5.90	1.05	6.0	1 to 7
94	94	5.02	0.97	5.0	2 to 7	94	6.00	1.04	6.0	2 to 7
95	94	4.85	1.09	5.0	1 to 7	93	6.71	0.79	7.0	1 to 7
96	93	4.19	1.10	4.0	2 to 7	93	6.72	0.65	7.0	4 to 7
97	94	2.71	1.10	3.0	1 to 6	94	6.19	1.23	7.0	1 to 7
98	92	3.62	0.98	4.0	1 to 6	92	4.11	1.26	4.0	1 to 7
99	94	3.32	0.98	3.0	1 to 7	94	4.41	1.02	4.0	2 to 6
100	94	4.23	1.10	4.0	2 to 7	94	6.40	0.77	7.0	3 to 7
N29	94	5.63	0.83	6.0	3 to 7	94	6.90	0.33	7.0	5 to 7
101	93	4.11	1.14	4.0	1 to 7	93	4.14	1.49	4.0	1 to 7
102	94	4.46	1.17	4.0	1 to 7	93	5.40	1.32	6.0	1 to 7
103	94	4.86	1.14	5.0	1 to 7	94	5.48	1.22	6.0	2 to 7
104	93	4.22	1.11	4.0	1 to 7	93	4.52	1.48	4.0	2 to 7
105	91	4.13	1.14	4.0	1 to 7	91	5.29	1.38	6.0	1 to 7

	Likelihood					Desirability				
Item	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Med**	**Range**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Med**	**Range**
N30	91	3.95	1.21	4.0	1 to 7	92	5.13	1.82	5.0	1 to 7
N31	90	3.02	1.10	3.0	1 to 6	90	5.98	1.54	7.0	1 to 7
106	93	4.25	1.21	4.0	2 to 7	93	6.72	0.52	7.0	5 to 7
107	93	4.42	1.13	5.0	2 to 7	93	6.08	0.97	6.0	3 to 7
108	94	4.69	1.02	5.0	2 to 7	94	6.16	0.93	6.0	3 to 7
109	93	4.44	0.94	4.0	2 to 6	93	4.82	1.28	5.0	1 to 7
110	94	4.70	0.87	5.0	2 to 6	94	5.77	1.03	6.0	1 to 7
111	92	5.03	0.92	5.0	2 to 7	92	5.62	1.05	6.0	2 to 7
112	92	5.67	1.10	6.0	2 to 7	92	1.64	1.06	1.0	1 to 6
113	92	5.11	1.15	5.0	2 to 7	91	1.88	1.19	2.0	1 to 6
114	94	3.65	0.98	4.0	2 to 6	94	3.66	1.35	4.0	1 to 7
115	94	4.06	1.34	4.0	1 to 7	94	3.26	1.61	3.0	1 to 7
N32	91	5.74	0.93	6.0	2 to 7	91	5.77	1.51	6.0	1 to 7
116	94	2.80	0.84	3.0	1 to 5	93	3.81	1.42	4.0	1 to 7
N33	94	3.26	1.19	3.0	1 to 6	94	4.70	1.44	5.0	1 to 7
117	94	4.18	1.05	4.0	2 to 6	94	5.16	1.15	5.0	1 to 7
118a	94	3.91	1.00	4.0	2 to 6	94	5.21	1.09	5.0	2 to 7
118b	92	2.28	1.14	2.0	1 to 6	93	2.83	1.59	2.0	1 to 7
119	93	2.58	1.11	2.0	1 to 6	93	4.26	1.47	4.0	1 to 7
120	93	4.66	1.06	5.0	1 to 7	92	6.48	0.72	7.0	4 to 7
N34	91	4.16	1.28	4.0	1 to 7	91	5.81	1.29	6.0	2 to 7
N35	90	3.93	1.31	4.0	1 to 7	91	5.86	1.32	6.0	2 to 7
N36	89	3.78	1.12	4.0	1 to 7	89	6.22	1.20	7.0	2 to 7
121	93	4.73	0.92	5.0	2 to 6	93	5.59	1.23	6.0	2 to 7
122	93	4.69	1.19	5.0	1 to 7	93	6.32	0.86	7.0	4 to 7
123	92	3.62	0.95	4.0	2 to 6	92	5.27	1.24	5.5	2 to 7
124	91	4.27	1.10	4.0	1 to 6	91	6.11	1.12	6.0	1 to 7
125	93	4.70	1.06	5.0	2 to 7	92	6.14	0.90	6.0	4 to 7
126	92	3.42	1.13	3.0	1 to 6	92	6.77	0.47	7.0	5 to 7
127	93	5.22	0.98	5.0	2 to 7	93	6.53	0.62	7.0	4 to 7
128	93	4.83	0.95	5.0	2 to 7	93	6.45	0.76	7.0	3 to 7
129	91	4.89	0.81	5.0	3 to 7	90	6.53	0.72	7.0	4 to 7
130	93	4.70	1.06	5.0	2 to 7	93	5.96	1.03	6.0	3 to 7
131	93	4.40	1.00	4.0	1 to 7	93	6.61	0.64	7.0	4 to 7
132	93	3.99	1.08	4.0	1 to 6	93	6.35	0.72	6.0	4 to 7
133	93	4.89	0.90	5.0	2 to 7	93	6.34	0.83	6.0	2 to 7

	Likelihood					Desirability				
Item	N	Mean	SD	Med	Range	N	Mean	SD	Med	Range
134a	92	3.68	1.04	4.0	1 to 6	92	5.55	1.26	6.0	1 to 7
134b	92	2.96	1.12	3.0	1 to 6	92	4.59	1.39	4.0	2 to 7
135	92	1.92	0.79	2.0	1 to 5	92	3.48	1.33	3.5	1 to 7
136	93	4.67	1.12	5.0	1 to 6	93	6.13	1.06	6.0	2 to 7
137	93	5.03	0.81	5.0	2 to 7	93	6.30	0.82	6.0	3 to 7
138	92	4.38	0.99	4.0	1 to 6	91	6.34	0.73	6.0	4 to 7
139	92	3.51	1.19	4.0	1 to 6	92	6.64	0.85	7.0	1 to 7
N37	90	5.73	1.24	6.0	2 to 7	92	6.64	0.85	7.0	1 to 7
140	92	4.37	1.07	4.0	2 to 7	92	6.21	0.75	6.0	4 to 7
141	92	4.65	0.99	5.0	1 to 7	92	6.22	0.80	6.0	4 to 7
142	92	3.55	1.17	3.5	1 to 6	92	5.70	1.25	6.0	1 to 7
143	92	2.70	1.28	2.0	1 to 6	92	2.21	1.44	2.0	1 to 7
144	91	5.10	0.88	5.0	1 to 7	91	6.30	0.89	6.0	3 to 7
145	91	4.60	1.01	5.0	3 to 7	91	1.62	1.02	1.0	1 to 7
146	91	4.73	1.18	5.0	2 to 7	91	1.92	1.13	2.0	1 to 6
N38	89	3.58	1.27	3.0	1 to 7	89	4.31	1.95	4.0	1 to 7
N39	91	5.84	1.43	6.0	1 to 7	91	1.51	1.07	1.0	1 to 6
N40	91	6.00	1.23	6.0	1 to 7	90	1.28	0.81	1.0	1 to 5
N41	87	5.98	1.31	7.0	1 to 7	85	2.61	1.13	3.0	1 to 7

Appendix B:
Round II Delphi Instrument

Appendix B: Round II Delphi Instrument

The following instrument was used in Round II of the issues and trends identification process conducted by the Federal Resource Center. For Round II, the mean, standard deviation, and number of respondents for each item on likelihood and desirability was provided for each item. In addition the approximate mean value was marked on the 1 to 7 value rating scale for the items. The Round II instrument also included new items identified with N and a number. New items were inserted as close in proximity as feasible to the point were they were suggested by respondents. If the new items were rated by the participants these values were also included. Comments from Round I were reported on each item so that they could be used by respondents in making their assessment of likelihood and desirability for Round II.

THE FEDERAL RESOURCE CENTER
IN COOPERATION WITH
THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
PROJECT ON IDENTIFICATION OF TRENDS AND ISSUES IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

Name: ______________________________

Code: ______________________________

DELPHI SURVEY: ROUND II

Instructions:

Please provide ratings on the likelihood and the desirability of trends or changes which would be of importance in the field of special education should they occur by responding to each of the items on the following pages. The time frame for the predictions is "within the next 20 years."

Please read the summary of Round I responses before you begin Round II. This will provide you with information on the Round I results. Numerical data (item mean, standard deviation, and number of respondents) are provided with each item directly on the rating sheet for Round II as well as in the summary information package.

As in the first round, statements predicting particular changes or trends are given in the column on the left side of the form. Your responses should go directly on the form to the right of each of the predictive statements. Please draw a circle around a number in the continuum from (1) to (7) which best represents your view of each predictive statement's likelihood and its desirability. You may wish to pace yourself by taking occasional breaks.

You will note that on "likelihood" the continuum ranges from "unlikely" to "likely." On "desirability" the continuum ranges from "undesirable" to "desirable." Comments from Round I are provided in the column on the left of the form. New items have been added by participants and have an "N" as part of their item number. Mean (X), Standard Deviation (SD), and Number of respondents (N) are provided for each item for likelihood and desirability. In addition, the mean is marked with a line on the seven point scale. Please treat each item independently and keep in mind that the time frame used is **"within the next 20 years."**

Based on comments by participants some of the original items have been edited or split into two different items for this round. Strikethru was used to indicate words deleted from an item and underline indicates new words added. Split items are numbered with an "a" and "b" (e.g., 121a, 121b).

Note: The term "categorical" as used in this survey refers to categories of children–such as mental retardation, visually impaired, or seriously emotionally disturbed, –as sometimes used in the field of special education.

PLEASE RETURN IN ENVELOPE PROVIDED BY MAY 15, 1992.

Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
1 State run institutions serving individuals with severe and low incidence disabilities will be closed.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.47 SD=1.59 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.99 SD=1.82 N=114	

Comments on Item 1:

This option on the continuum should be available but should be used only when the needs of the child are such that this option is the LRE.

There will always be children whose families cannot manage their severe medical and physical needs.

Only if alternative placements are available.

Not large institutions but small state run group homes.

Small segment of the population needs institutional care.

Critical by law to provide a full continuum of service–close them totally it hurts rural areas.

Medical concerns preclude public school attendance in many of these cases.

Will still exist but dramatically fewer.

Closed - reopened by then.

Very likely and desirable for institutions as defined in the traditional sense of custodial and away from communities and family life.–However, state operated community integrated family programs for S. and L. are highly desirable.

Very desirable–but we have not done enough to provide alternatives.

Institutionalization needs to be one of the options.

A few states are already moving in this direction (e.g., VT).

Some forms of disability are so incapacitating as to preclude, given existing knowledge and technology, the ability to serve such individuals in anything other than an institutional setting.

Large residential institutions, yes; smaller state run facilities may persist.

Depends more on federal/ state policies and economics than on professional/ family values.

Schools for deaf will be with us (and should be) others likely to be closed.

Under 4 beds.

Increased pressures on LEAs.

There will still be a need for institutions, hopefully for short-term care.

Currently in my state, this is real for all programs, except one.

Unless statutes change a continuum must be available–deaf community is very influential.

Most will close, but there will still be a need.

A small proportion of children with the most severe disabilities should be served by the state.

The need to differentiate between very severe and profound from severe is needed; too, adult vs child populations. State run programs may replace institutions.

N1 Private for profit group homes for children and youth with severe and low incidence disabilities will take the place of state institutions.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.0 SD=0.0 N=1	

<table>
<tr><th>Predictive Statement</th><th>Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)</th><th>Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)</th><th>Additional Comments</th></tr>
<tr><td>2 A full range of program options and services will be available for students with **severe and low incidence disabilities** in their neighborhood schools.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=4.67
SD=1.44
N=114</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=6.33
SD=1.06
N=115</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comments on Item 2:
Desirability tempered by the fact that a fair number of families prefer out of community placements.
We will become better skilled at inclusion and integration.
Exceptions will be rural, western districts, (i.e., a district with 70 students).
The economic situation would need to change a lot for all low incidence disabilities to be in their neighborhood schools.
Will need to balance quality–particularly issue of availability of personnel.
As related services increase (as required by law) finding qualified bodies to provide services particularly in the poverty stricken rural areas becomes difficult.
Dependent upon student numbers and teacher availability and training in general ed.
This might not be really possible in geographical areas with low density populations.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>3 Children and youth with **severe and low incidence disabilities** will be ~~fully integrated into regular classrooms~~ served in inclusive schools.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=3.83
SD=1.35
N=115</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=4.88
SD=1.67
N=115</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comments on Item 3
LRE must be met as appropriate for each child–assuming this is good for all is a false assumption.
As appropriate...
Appropriate use of LRE meets needs of children.
At least for part of the school day.
Full day may not be advantageous to these students and youth with severe and low incidence disabilities.
Must not ever mandate a service delivery–look at each child's needs.
Case-by-case but definitely greater possibility.
Desirability contingent on inservice.
Integrated and then segregated.
Full integration in all classes makes little sense. The criterion for placement should be other than more integration.
"Fully integrated" can mean different things to different people.
Do we really know what "fully integrated" means for this population?
Mixing severe and low incidence makes this prediction difficult.
If "regular" means appropriate training and resources for the teachers to individualize need integration.
Integrated fully? The desire is there but reality????
"Fully integrated" is not a standard term.
Challenges with SED pop. as well as Deaf/ HI.
While philosophically it is "right" to fully integrate the low incidence populations, we need to be cognizant of the support needed for the regular classroom teacher.
At what level?
"Fully integrated"–is it synonymous with full inclusion.
Desirable Yes! but fully integrated? Depends upon definition beyond "placement."
This is an idealistic goal which I do not feel is realistic.</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
N2 The regular education system will understand and accept their role in serving children and youth with **mild disabilities.**	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
4 Regulation of special education services will shift from monitoring processes to monitoring outcomes.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.03 SD=1.43 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.03 SD=1.60 N=115	

Comments on Item 4:
Predictability of success has so many other variables other than school sp. ed. services.
Although much depends on what "outcomes" are monitored–very desirable.
Should not shift, but should do both–very desirable.
Monitoring process and outcome is desirable; not a shift from one to the other–an integration of both is desirable.
Highly likely–Need some of both.
False dichotomy. Wayne Morse–"give me control of procedures (process) and I will control substance (outcomes)."
This is a difficult question: process needs to be monitored and outcome is not a steady state.
Very desirable knowing some attention to process will always be needed.
I see a combination rather than forsaking one for the other.
It would be wonderful.
Move toward outcomes.
Unclear. If monitoring is for compliance with federal regs. then it probably will not happen, nor will it be desirable.

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood**	**Desirability**	**Additional Comments**
5 Current federal monitoring processes will be shifted to the states.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.15 SD=1.47 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.66 SD=1.78 N=114	

Comments on Item 5:
A Federal presence helps to provide a checks and balance.
States should play a major role, but given the interests of Congress in Federal monitoring, it is not likely that it will shift to states.
There needs to be a federal overall accountability to monitor states.
For some states this would work fine. For many it will reduce the quality of programs.
I don't know about this one.
The current federal process is not useful.
Effective tool to assure appropriate services are being provided.
This is true now–I don't understand this statement; all states do the same things to LEAs.
Given my answer to #6, I have a difficult time answering this one (Feds now focus on state monitoring process.).
Both processes and outcomes will be expected of both fed. and state.
This implies a totality that is unlikely. If "many" were used to define scope it would be easier to rate.
Both state and federal monitoring needs to be kept in place.
Unclear. If monitoring is for compliance with federal regs. then it probably will not happen, nor will it be desirable.

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
N3 Policy will be made with a more realistic assessment of available state fiscal resources and available personnel.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 [✓ 5] 6 7 X=5.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 [✓ 4] 5 6 7 X=4.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
Comment on Item N3: If this is to work much planning needs to be done by training institutions (reg. and sp. ed), and school systems in terms of how to accept and handle all children.			
6 Deleted. This item and item 34 were judged to be duplicates.			
N4 Local school districts will self-monitor to establish standards.	Unlikely Likely [✓ 1] 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 [✓ 7] X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
N5 Public law 94-142 will be rewritten to take out legalized aspects.	Unlikely Likely [✓ 1] 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 [✓ 6] 7 X=6 SD=0.0 N=1	
N6 "Related services" will continue to expand in type, quantity and variety, creating a drain on funding resources.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 [✓ 7] X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 [✓ 2] 3 4 5 6 7 X=2.0 SD=0.0 N=1	

<table>
<tr><th>Predictive Statement</th><th>Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)</th><th>Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)</th><th>Additional Comments</th></tr>
<tr><td>7 States will significantly expand follow-up data collection efforts to measure the outcomes of special education services.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=5.31
SD=1.29
N=114</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=6.27
SD=1.12
N=114</td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comments on Item 7:
Only valuable if the process yields results for students rather than just more data.
Information is vital.
The resulting outcomes are goals which are the most critical.
Will occur only if mandated.
Tax payers will demand it.
It is difficult to manage what we have to collect now.
State budgets (declines) will be a barrier.
Reality of the labor associated with follow-up and "authentic" assessment will slow development.
We need to be more accountable for what is going on in the spec. ed. classes as well as the quality of our related services. I feel that in many instances, services are provided to satisfy the IEP and parents and not to improve the child.
Data collection is beginning to take up more time than teaching. Depends on How and Who.
We need this data.</td></tr>
<tr><td>8 Special education outcome data collection will be incorporated within the total educational assessment effort and will not be a separate system.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=4.87
SD=1.34
N=114</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=6.28
SD=1.04
N=114</td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comments on Item 8:
Confidentiality is most important.
If it is still special ed., we should want to measure effectiveness.
Trying to move in this direction, but progress is slow–very desirable.
Neutral, just so it is done.
Assessment as it is, is becoming too automated with little regard to the true needs of the child. That is, we match scores to a criteria too much!!</td></tr>
</table>

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
9 The efficacy of special education services will be determined ~~three-to-five~~ five-to-ten years after students leave school and will be based on outcomes in work, school, leisure, success in postsecondary education, and competitive employment.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.51 SD=1.33 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.10 SD=1.23 N=114	
Comments on Item 9: Very important. Five years is too short a time period to measure successful adult integration. Efficacy of special education should be determined by student outcomes as well as after students leave school. As a nation we need to recognize the impact of environmental conditions. Special education students will be the last considered in times of economic distress. Quality of life is also an outcome. Outcomes are also relative to the nature of the disability. Highly desirable–but 3-to-5 years is not sufficient. Periodic follow-up in 5-10 year epoches is very necessary. Learning in functioning occurs in young and middle aged adults with special needs as function of prior appropriate education. Will be determined two years after. Accountability and "negligence" in education? This would be ideal. Individual Transition Plans are good but follow-up will be costly, and we may not end up knowing all the answers in regards to efficacy. Very desirable but highly dependent on a shared vision/ mission of sp. ed. services by professionals, parents and advocates.			

<table>
<tr><th>Predictive Statement</th><th>Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)</th><th>Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)</th><th>Additional Comments</th></tr>
<tr><td>10 Special education services will be limited to meeting the needs of students with moderate to severe disabilities.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=3.92
SD=1.62
N=113</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=4.20
SD=2.18
N=114</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comments on Item 10:
If this means those with less severe disabilities do not receive services, it is highly undesirable; however, if it means that the needs of these students will be met without segregating them out of the regular classroom, it would be highly desirable.
Would be a positive indicator if it meant regular education was appropriately serving mildly disabled students.
Support services still needed.
Congress and state legislatures seem to think nearly everyone has a disability that needs remediation.
With support personnel for regular ed. teachers.
I think that the concept and nomenclature will change to more accurately reflect its place in a continuum of educational strategies and service modalities–"special ed." will disappear.
This is desirable assuming that reg. education accepts responsibility for all student needs.
This is likely and desirable only if support is provided.
We are serving too many students in special education.
If all children are appropriately educated–wonderful!
Attention needed for at risk.
I would like to be more positive regarding the likelihood of 10 and 11. However, the past 20 years has failed to demonstrate an ability to apply what we knew/ know into practice.
Lobbying groups for the mildly disabled are too powerful. I feel though that because we are still floundering with what is SLD we ought to eliminate it from 94-142. Because of this disability, we are placing too many children in special education.
This will come slowly.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>N7 "Special services" will function as a support to regular education programs and personnel rather than an alternative education for learners with disabilities.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=6.0
SD=0.0
N=1</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=7.0
SD=0.0
N=1</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>N8 Special education services for students with disabilities will be the joint responsibility of special and regular education.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=5.0
SD=0.0
N=1</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=7.0
SD=0.0
N=1</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
11 Services for students with **mild disabilities** will become the exclusive responsibility of regular education with special education involvement limited to a support role.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.28 SD=1.68 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.96 SD=2.05 N=114	

Comments on Item 11:

It would be highly desirable for regular education to take responsibility for these children but not without the benefit of special educators who have expertise to assist in planning appropriate instruction.

Will only become a reality with mandate and fiscal incentives.

Regular ed. has vigorously refused this responsibility for over 20 years. I think we are going to revert to pre-EHA levels and dump mild handicaps into the mainstream.

Desirability high due to financial restraints.

Must provide appropriate LRE for ALL.

Delivery of services will be modified and/ or expanded but the responsible parties will share the services.

Responsibility is much less important than providing service in reg. classes.

Desirability low without inservice [training].

With some support from sp. ed.

Not necessarily desirable.

It depends on what "regular ed." means. Certain diagnoses require very special education preparation to provide individually appropriate services.

I doubt reg. ed. is doing anything in this direction. On the contrary, it is still trying to get rid of any kid who is different. Consider what is happening with ADD!

Not "exclusive."

We will have come full circle then.

Does this allow for teacher support from spec. ed.?

This would be best for all–especially the students.

This is likely and desirable only if support is provided.

I would like to be more positive regarding the likelihood of 10 and 11. However, the past 20 years has failed to demonstrate an ability to apply what we knew/ know into practice.

Attitudes of general educators will have to change first.

N9 Higher education will include special education training for all students graduating with degrees in education.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
N10 Funding mechanisms will change to allow services for students with **mild disabilities** to become the exclusive responsibility of regular education.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
N11 Mildly disabled students will be provided with increasing amounts of ancillary or related services (e.g., OT, PT, counseling, etc).	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
12 SEAs will contract with external agencies or businesses for full compliance monitoring services.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.82 SD=1.32 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.91 SD=1.68 N=114	
Comments on Item 12: So many factors are involved that without additional facts listed it is not possible to determine the desirability or the likelihood that this will happen. Not as the only monitoring agency. Currently, the auditing of grants entitlement funds are bid out: the contract provider has no idea of what the regulations are and often misses serious violations. Some SEAs, yes to maybe. Depends on how it is handled–quality assurance is key! SEAs should do this. Many discussions of "privatization" not hard data on savings. Am interested in responses to this item. Would like more info on this matter. Internal consistency will be a major question. Depends on agencies.			
13 States, rather than local districts, will become increasingly responsible for school funding.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.59 SD=1.69 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.10 SD=1.62 N=115	
Comments on Item 13: Autonomy is a big issue–hard to break down. Desirability high –To create, equal education opportunities–would more evenly distribute wealth. I doubt that "local control" will give way to a centralized education system. Necessary for equitable funding but will require governance changes. It needs to be a combination of federal, state and local program funding. Our state is [doing this], but more local funding is needed. In my state, it's happening already with resulting more equitable education for all students. Depends on state resources.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
14 State funding for special education teacher preparation programs will be severely cut.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.20 SD=1.55 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=2.00 SD=1.37 N=114	
Comments on Item 14: I think that "inclusive education" will require that all teachers will have "special" skills–training focus (and funds) will shift to general education and include paraprofessionals. –Not an issue in my part of the U.S. I have a problem–it is very desirable if it is replaced by the training of all teachers to deal with high incidence, but will always be needed for low incidence and severe. It's limited now. We need more and more staff if full integration is to take place. If special education can provide data to justify their needs, funding should remain secure.			
N12 All teachers will function as "instructional managers" of programs and support services needed to educate students with a wide-range of diverse needs.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
15 States will provide equalized funding for educational services in all school districts.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.86 SD=1.57 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.93 SD=1.49 N=114	
Comments for Item 15: Need to change political paradigm. Attempts will not guarantee equalization. There has to be equity for all schools regardless of location (i.e., inner city, suburbs, rural). Some school districts will require much higher funding supports than others–depends on population needs. Unlikely since no state has been able to achieve an equitable solution to funding. States will provide same amount of funding for educational services in all school districts. State funding should be fair			
N13 States will cut special education funding as more students are served in regular education.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.0 SD=0.0 N=1	

<table>
<tr><th>Predictive Statement</th><th>Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)</th><th>Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)</th><th>Additional Comments</th></tr>
<tr><td>16 The federal government will honor its 1975 commitment to fund 40 percent of the extra costs associated with special education.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=2.78
SD=1.56
N=114</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=6.33
SD=1.25
N=112</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comments on Item 16:
Funding and laws should match.
This will occur when cows fly! Sorry, but you hit one of my #1 pet peeves!
Desirability does not appear to fit a response.
Highly desirable–but may need to be increased given the increased need for prevention of behavior disorders, violence etc.
It would sure help!
Very desirable!
It depends on how you define sp. ed. This answer (low likelihood) assumes no change in definition.
However, if the feds moved to that now, we would be unable to use the $'s well if supplanting is enforced as currently defined.
I don't have that much confidence in the federal government doing this.
This is realistic if special education serves only students with the most severe disabilities.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>17 Management and funding for health and educational services delivered to children and youth with disabilities will become consolidated under one **federal** department.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=3.67
SD=1.67
N=114</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=5.18
SD=1.72
N=114</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comments on Item 17:
Without further facts and specifics it is impossible to rate. To me a score of 4 means "can't tell."
Those who know the least will most likely run areas pertaining to sp.ed.
504 and IDEA need to consolidate.
Poor question.
Statement is vague–services needs a modifier.
Centralized administration and power has advantages but also disadvantages.
Very desirable!
Federal agencies should serve all.
I'm not sure about how I feel about this.
Too massive an undertaking for one department.
Not likely due to territorial protection.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>N14 The shortage of special education teachers and therapists (OT, PT, psychologists, etc) will reach a crises level.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=7.0
SD=0.0
N=1</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=1.0
SD=0.0
N=1</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
18 Management and funding for services delivered to children and youth with disabilities will become consolidated under one state department.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.83 SD=1.63 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.96 SD=1.87 N=113	

Comments on Item 18:

Education and health will not ever agree to merge.

Cooperative efforts are a MUST!

I wish! But there would be the risk of being ... into a "separatist empire" to defeat inclusive education.

Services for persons with disabilities should be administered consistently with services for all children and youth.

Part H efforts are highlighting this need.

This may happen (is happening) in human services, but education is a separate issue.

Need to recognize agency roles.

Wow! Would it be nice.

Too massive an undertaking for one department. I do believe there will be some redistribution, however.

Unfortunately, health departments usually handle the infants and toddlers. Lack of coordination can occur with the state office.

19 Private sector funds for research and development in the *America 2000* plan will include special education as a priority.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.27 SD=1.49 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.05 SD=1.36 N=113	

Comments on Item 19:

All children include all children!

Seems as if people with special needs don't count in the economic priorities driving education reform!

Special needs students have been absent in *America 2000* and also the governor goals.

Services for all students need support not some program labelled "special education."

"*America 2000*" will probably cease to exist in the next 5 years, being replaced by a new initiative.

Russell Sage! Where are you when we need you?

Why a priority–aren't all kids important.

School restructuring will probably take the bulk of money.

I doubt that the private sector will embrace this as a priority. In reality, *America 2000* does not celebrate diversity.

Depends on how much effort sp. educators will put into this objective, and how receptive the private sector will be.

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
20 Budget and funding problems will ~~continue to~~ result in reduced services to at-risk infants and toddlers.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.76 SD=1.54 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.60 SD=1.24 N=111	
Comments on Item 20: Not likely–children will become a national priority. Negative wording a problem. I think we will see continued growth in ...programs simply because they relate to some economic and moral priorities. Situation should be rectified but highly unlikely. "Will continue" does not constitute change. Wording of this statement may not render "true" results. At least as great a problem is the problem of interagency coordination . I think it will get better, but not good enough. A greatly needed area of emphasis. It would help if consolidation occurs to departments which service the children.			
21 Training of parents of children with disabilities will become a priority of state departments of education.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.51 SD=1.43 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.91 SD=1.35 N=113	
Comments on Item 21: This has been a requirement for 15 years and has been ignored or resisted. I think it will become and increasing priority, but of ... or possibly a "budgeting authority" as suggested in #18. Likely due to *America 2000*. Budget constraints not desirability will keep many state depts. from making this a priority. This should be primarily the LEA's responsibility. Parent organizations in partnership with state department of education is desirable. Support perhaps but not training. Training is only suitable for some parents. Won't local level learn to do it in next 20 years. Schools need to do some, too!			
22 Funding for assistive technology will ~~double and~~ come from a variety of funding sources.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.91 SD=1.76 N=112	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.42 SD=0.96 N=112	
Comments on Item 22: It is desirable that funding come from a variety of sources, but not that it doubles. –increased funding is desirable, but "variety of sources" is not–should be one source. I don't think ... is large enough. No funding will double–especially since the 40% has not been met. Variety of sources–very desirable.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
23 Potential economic contributions by persons with disabilities will be valued by policymakers.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.71 SD=1.41 N=112	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.44 SD=0.96 N=112	
Comments on Item 23: It's been part of the political ... for years hasn't it? Mild/ moderate in particular. I'm not clear on political implications of this item. We define people too much in economic terms already.			
N15 There will be increased knowledge and understanding of the contributions persons with disabilities can realistically make to society.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
N16 Parent training will be a required high school course.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.0 SD=0.0 N=1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
24 Parents will participate as full decision making partners on policy issues at local and state levels.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.35 SD=1.63 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.96 SD=1.06 N=114	
Comments on Item 24: It is desirable that they become involved, however, without proper training I question them being "full partners." Many parents do not care to get involved. Many should not be given the power because of their inability to use it wisely. Not if by "policy" you refer to the legislative process. They already do have a participatory role in planning level for most programs. Will vary by district and community. "Parents" doesn't mean" "all" at this level; politics is largely an issue of social class. This too shall pass. Not ALL parents!			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood**: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability**: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
25 Special education research efforts will be focused on consumer needs.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.41 SD=1.19 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.69 SD=1.17 N=115	
Comments on Item 25: Research should not be exclusively need/ problem oriented. Consumer? Depends on how the ... goes–I doubt it. What is meant by consumer needs? Many possible interpretations for this item. Who is defined as consumer–students or teachers? Needs as determined by whom?			
26a Most children with **mild** disabilities will be retained in the general classroom as an alternative to pull out programs such as resource room configurations.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.25 SD=1.26 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.00 SD=1.23 N=115	
Comments on Item 26a: Increasingly yes, but some kids will still need separate services. Collaborative teaching between regular and special education, consultative model, class-with-in-a class, etc. will be the norm. General classroom structure will be modified. We are too limited on our structural thinking. Restructuring organizationally will change modes of service. I hope this is done for the right reasons and not thinking it will save money. Desirability high with inservice. Mixing mild and moderate on this one confuses the issue. With support to reg. ed. teacher. In some cases–not in all. Highly desirable–if "general" classroom is appropriately equipped to handle it appropriately–requires much additional teacher training and staffing. This issue is not how mild or severe the disability is but the results of what instruction and services are needed and where can they be delivered. Some may still need alternatives and need to have services based upon individual needs rather than blank statement. Let's not forget the regular teachers concerns! Mild yes; moderate no, especially behavioral. The inclusion of moderate here makes it extremely difficult to rate–separate the two for greater accuracy of rating. It is unlikely for this to happen in all cases.			
26b Most children with **moderate** disabilities will be retained in the general classroom as an alternative to pull out programs such as self-contained and resource room configurations.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
27a Special education personnel will provide primarily consultative services to teachers for children with **severe** disabilities rather than direct services to children in separate classrooms.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.90 SD=1.46 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.29 SD=1.87 N=114	

Comments on Item 27a:

However, this will entail preparation and employment of competent paraprofessionals. I believe some apply to OT, PT SLP, etc, so the paras will have to be able to function in transdisciplinary role.

I hope this is done for the right reasons and not thinking it will save money.

Not good enough!

A goal but not realistic.

Skills generalists–low desirability.

There will always need to be a separate environment for some children.

Sp. ed. teachers will become members of a team and instruction and services will be delivered by the team–consultation alone has only minimum utility.

I think many of our special education leaders need more dialogue with the regular education sector. Model programs can work but a change for all?

27b Special education personnel will provide primarily consultative services to teachers for children with **mild** disabilities rather than direct services to children in separate classrooms.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
28 Greater emphasis will be placed on socialization/ communicative and motivational dimensions rather than on basic skill acquisition in special education programs for students with severe disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.16 SD=1.24 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.86 SD=1.41 N=115	

Comments on Item 28:
Depends on student and range of services available.
Basic skills will be the major emphasis–more attention will be given to the other area–not to exclude basic skills.
Courts are forcing this now–highly desirable.
Both areas of emphasis are essential.
For which group mild? severe?
Depends upon the needs and long-term outcome targets for the different clusters of needs.
Can't be an either/ or.
There should be a balance between socialization and basic skills.
For severe–highly desirable, for mild/ moderate–4.
All aspects mentioned are equally important and interrelated.
For how long? To whom? Which impairments or disabilities?
Greater emphasis in addition to not rather than.
These choices do not allow for the general education shift to "process skills," an appropriate emphasis for spec. ed. as well–low desirability.
It depends on who we work with–my wife who is a sp. ed. teacher for the mildly disabled taught a child who became an Academic All American 4 yrs. later. I shudder to think what would have happened if she didn't push this non-gifted special education student to greater academic heights before decertification took place.
Very likely and desirable–based on assumption that sp. ed. will serve only moderately to severely disabled.
Not to the exclusion of one or the other.

N17 The work of schools will change from coverage of content to the development of learning processes.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
N18 Team teaching with special and regular education in the classroom will be prevalent.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	

Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
29 Outcomes for students with more severe disabilities in special education will address functional life skills, rather than isolated academic skills.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.38 SD=1.18 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.30 SD=1.08 N=114	
Comments on Item 29: The IDEA transition requirement requires this because it is not being done–highly desirable. It will necessarily include both. For which group – the answers may change? For those students that can perform sufficiently in the academic skills, should receive the skills. If "special education" means severe/ profound then observation ...is fine. Poor statement. Has little meaning Re: the individual student. I don't know what "isolated academic skills" means! We must do this. Outcomes must be student specific. Particularly important for children with significant disabilities. Kids with M/M disabilities will need academic competency but not "isolated" skills. Emphasis must be on integrating academic competency and life skills. By integrating content with the basic skills, much can be achieved academically. In some respects sp. ed. teachers are not trained well enough to teach language arts, etc. effectively. Outcome, however, is somewhat realistic if we deal with the moderately and severely disabled. Depends on learner needs. Isolated? Academic skills needed for functional life skills will be important.			
30 The gap between high school completion rates of students with disabilities and rates for non-disabled students will be ~~drastically~~ reduced.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.50 SD=1.45 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.64 SD=0.80 N=114	
Comments on Item 30: Emphasis must also be on keeping nondisabled in school. Reduced, yes. 2 questions dramatic reductions. That would be great. "Completion rate " is. Depends on what that means! Simply passing them through is a great disservice! Like the word completion rather than graduation. We will improve–highly desirable! Single parent/ poverty/ disability are intertwined in the completion rate–not likely.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
31 Special education service providers will reflect the cultural, racial, linguistic, and ethnic mix of the community.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.23 SD=1.52 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.44 SD=0.95 N=114	
Comments on Item 31: Our current regular education system does not allow for this. See multi-cultural graduation rates. If appropriate quality education is provided for such teachers and providers. Good teachers are what we need! These ratings (low likelihood, high desirability) are based on the assumption that the sp. ed. personnel will be composed of racial/ cultural diversity.			
32 Special education professionals will be sensitive to specific learning and interpersonal styles of children with disabilities from diverse cultural, racial, linguistic, and ethnic backgrounds and adapt their service delivery approaches accordingly.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.87 SD=1.33 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.62 SD=0.82 N=114	
Comments on Item 32: Hopefully, this will take place before the next 20 years. It's certainly crucial now and necessary. Highly desirable–if appropriately done and not used to shirk responsibilities. It is highly desirable that they are sensitive to learning styles, but America is still the "melting pot." Cultural sensitivity is very admirable as is the recognition of diversity and differences. This can and has been taken too far. And reg. ed.–highly desirable There is a close working relationship with SLRP personnel and sp. ed. to improve the delivery of service. We need valid assessment tools for learning styles before we place students at risk with unvalidated programs. I believe this already exists with regard to sensitivity by spec. ed. professionals; it is the general ed. professional who is less sensitive at this time–the sensitivity issues ought to be directed to the latter–highly desirable and very likely. Low likelihood–unless preparation programs (and the trainers) change, outcomes will not change for the better!			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood**: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability**: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
33 Discrimination ~~toward persons with disabilities~~ on the basis of disability in employment, in the provision of services by public agencies, in public accommodations, and in access to telecommunications services will be virtually eliminated.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 | 5 6 7 X=4.41 SD=1.54 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 |7 X=6.90 SD=0.31 N=115	
Comments on Item 33: It will be about as "good" as it is for African-Americans, women, Hispanics and others–not likely. Not that soon. Discrimination on the basis of disability (not simply "toward")? Based on nearly 20 years of experience with Section 504, this statement is unlikely to be accurate. Reduced greatly–but people find more sophisticated ways to discriminate. It will improve but not be "virtually eliminated." Desirable but cost is a barrier.			
34 Federal monitoring will be increasingly focused on the state's ability to carry out the monitoring of the delivery of special education services by local agencies and state operated facilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 | 6 7 X=5.35 SD=1.10 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 | 6 7 X=5.69 SD=1.22 N=115	
Comments on Item 34: Either I'm reading this wrong or it is the same as #6, p.2. I think the Feds have to reluctantly realize this is the only thing that makes sense . I doubt if we will see much change in Congressional and fed. bureaucratic ..., regardless of what party is in office! In the midst of what feels like a deregulatory period, it's hard to say whether fed. monitoring of sp. ed. will exist at all. As long as we don't drown in monitoring and monitoring does anything. You asked this in #6. Should focus on result/ outcomes of services. Unclear. If monitoring is for compliance with federal regs. then it probably will not happen, nor will it be desirable.			

<table>
<tr><th>Predictive Statement</th><th>Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)</th><th>Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)</th><th>Additional Comments</th></tr>
<tr><td>35 Research will be focused on identifying subtleties in the delivery of special education and related services that are limiting the effectiveness of services to children who are culturally and linguistically different.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=4.64
SD=1.19
N=115</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=5.41
SD=1.38
N=115</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comments on Item 35:
Attention to this area is important, but focus in any exclusive sense is not appropriate for this or any other issue.
Research should focus on what is limiting the efficacy of services in general.
More important fish to fry–like strategies/ ...to support inclusive education will fund bigger, better market.
Are these factors truly subtle?
Wrong tree–not just sp. ed. and related services but all services and less that than whether we can even define/ agree to common culture.
Highly desirable, but this is difficult research which needs longitudinal studies, and are notoriously underfunded and often poorly designed.
I have no idea what is meant by "subtleties." Education has yet to pay much attention to the "grosseties"!
Research is needed in all areas of special education and related services.
Some research...</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>36 Parents will play a more significant role in the special education decision making process.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=5.34
SD=1.24
N=115</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=6.30
SD=0.95
N=115</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comments on Item 36:
Proper training will be necessary.
This has increased and hopefully will continue with increased parental involvement and the desire to see their children back in the mainstream.
Specialized training is highly desirable and to be valued. Experts should be valued and the total community considered.
Parents will deserve the appropriate education and information, as well as, emotional support services to make these decisions appropriately.
A great goal!
A few parents do. We must involve more.
IEP conferences, in many instances, have become less parent involved. It's a more a "get it over" with process–how to get our parents more involved is most important.</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
37 Parents of children with disabilities will have the right to exercise school choice and school systems will have to provide a free appropriate education at the school the parent has chosen.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.23 SD=1.49 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.30 SD=1.90 N=114	

Comments on Item 37:
"Choices" will be made by service providers, not by parents–highly desirable.
Too many variables to determine if this is even appropriate.
This would be prohibitively expensive.
I'm not inclined to favor open enrollment for any student.
I think this is a ridiculous idea ...of cost-efficiency; every school has to meet requirements, whether they do it well or not.
Unnecessary duplication within districts will slow this process considerably.
Does this mean any specific school?
Only in some geographic areas–both desirable and likely.
Only to the extent this is true for the general population.
I don't know about desirability–the advantages of neighborhood schools are many.
This response is based on my feeling that choice programs are not desirable for any student especially if private schools are included.
Highly undesirable–I think "choice" is a masquerade for creating social stratification of education with public funding.
I see nothing to be gained by school shopping.
I think more choice is coming but it will be very expensive to put services in every school.
Our state does this now–highly likely and very desirable.
Cost (?) could be a major factor plus what the Supreme Court decides in MN case.
Two questions here; choice vs accommodation.

Predictive Statement	Likelihood	Desirability	Additional Comments
38 Adults with disabilities will be **fully** involved in virtually all aspects of special education policy and program development.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.36 SD=1.45 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.88 SD=1.23 N=113	

Comments on Item 38:
Not that fast–not likely.
I hope people will be chosen for their expertise not on the basis of race, gender, or disabling condition.
We've improved in this area–very likely.

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
39 Adult service programs will be expanded to **fully** meet the needs of students with disabilities exiting school programs.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.87 SD=1.60 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.59 SD=0.89 N=114	
Comments on Item 39: Fat chance! Until those two are "tied" together this will not happen. We have a long way to go. Awkward statement. Support services to adults over 21 with disabilities are not provided by Dept. of Ed. We need to get out of the special services–go generic.			
40 Paraprofessionals will provide ~~direct~~ instructional services to children with disabilities rather than just fulfilling a supporting role.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.37 SD=1.22 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.18 SD=1.65 N=114	
Comments on Item 40: Depends on the student and the training for paraprofessionals. They already do this. As noted under #27, it has to go this way, or no go! Desirable as long as they are properly trained. Due to the shortage of sp. ed. certified teachers, there will be little question of the paraprofessional teaching–very likely. This is true today. Inevitable. Depends on need and skill. Supported employment training etc. will cause this to happen more–very likely I hope not for instruction–probably yes for related services–not desirable. More and more this is happening but sometimes without great supervision and training. For severe disabilities–yes! Training and career ladders probably will accompany the change. Limitations in training and cost. This is very ambiguous as many do this now especially in institutional settings. Needs to be more specific in type of direct service and setting where delivered.			
N19 Paraprofessionals will have an increasingly important role in service delivery.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	

Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
41 Education and human services curricula will attract less qualified ~~able~~ college entrants.	Unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Likely X=4.14 SD=1.34 N=114	Undesirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Desirable X=1.60 SD=1.11 N=114	

Comments on Item 41:

Depends on income and image of the occupation.

Interesting idea. Why? Training at the para level?

Need the best to be recruited. Competition of $, etc. too stiff.

Also will attract some geniuses who have good hearts and are not motivated by money. This phenomenon, on average, is an economic one. Medicine (a "human service") will still attract very able people (on average) because one can earn $200,000 a year doing good medicine. If teachers could earn respect of the community and $150,000 a year, the brightest people would be teachers.

Rather than "attract" replace with "will be designed to"

We need our very best in education.

I don't know how they can be much "less able" than they are now .

Disabled or less qualified? "Less able" than whom?

12 month school year will help "teaching" become a real profession.

Unless more careful screening is done. The teaching field has deteriorated considerably because many enter for the wrong reasons and there is little criteria, standards, or modeling available. Teacher education programs are too loose.

The current teacher corp is probably less bright and less capable than their predecessors. Why? Women's occupational options have increased and more capable ones are going into higher paying fields.

Low salaries job demands other than teaching make this likely.

If sufficient incentives are there, and higher entrance criteria upheld–this won't be likely.

Predictive Statement	Likelihood	Desirability	Additional Comments
42 The use of cooperative learning approaches for students with and without disabilities will become standard practice.	Unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Likely X=5.40 SD=1.11 N=114	Undesirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Desirable X=6.29 SD=0.94 N=114	

Comments on Item 42:

It works very well at my school and should be a part of the school program.

Widely used, yes. Standard practice is overstating the need –low likelihood and desirability.

Define cooperative learning approaches.

This is desirable assuming that this is a part of the learning process.

"A"

Undoubtedly! One of the greatest potential approaches in humanizing education for our children.

Coop. learning is not a cure-all. It's not appropriate for all people at all times across all content or curricular areas.

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
43 Schools will become community service centers for life-long learning and integration of educational and human services for persons with and without disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.85 SD=1.52 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.45 SD=0.96 N=115	
Comments on Item 43: Not without funds–likelihood low. Boston has begun to make plans for schools that will provide a total program for all families–very likely and desirable. The issue is not who, but how–like, need to look at newer systems models (e.g., ..., organizations, etc.) The community should be the locus of responsibility, perhaps making use of school buildings, but not making the schools solely responsible. What schools – SEAs? Vo-tech? Community Colleges? K-12? Highly desirable–provided additional funds flow through to the schools. Will require participation of other resources and agencies–highly desirable Not desirable since schools are not the only model and not a real-life model for life long community service centers. This concept has been around forever and in some places it is already a reality. Adult community schools will be more of a primary focus. They're usually located on school campuses, however. Ideal, but administrators need to have more training across more disciplines.			
N20 Vo-tech and community colleges will become community service centers for life-long learning and integration of educational and human services for persons with and without disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
44 Employers will encourage workers who dropped out of high school to earn an equivalence degree by sponsoring GED programs at the job site and providing time to attend classes.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.93 SD=1.27 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.15 SD=1.28 N=113	
Comments on Item 44: In 20 years virtually everyone will complete high school as a necessity for life and work. GED is of no value–other, more educational training needs to be provided (i.e., match as it applies to a plumber. We are involved in such a process now with Alcoa–likely and desirable. Might be nice, but a GED is not an economic asset to the employer. My guess is public $'s will need to support this. Employers will provide opportunities to develop needed skills not necessarily to gain the GED. That means we're [schools] are not doing our jobs–not desirable. Adult community schools will provide the bulk of services for GED students. It would be a financial hardship for certain business. Retraining for work related skills rather than completion of a h. s. curriculum seems more likely. If schools don't respond. If partnerships never materialize.			
45 Schooling will become an entitlement of a certain number of years (e.g., 13) with dropouts allowed to return at any age to a publicly supported age- appropriate educational settings.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.54 SD=1.53 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.88 SD=1.47 N=115	
Comments on Item 45: Age differences may create some very inappropriate situations in classes that have limited offerings. Given demographics, something like this will be needed to produce a viable workforce. Clarify what return at certain age means. If a dropout returns at age 27, he/she should return to adult education not to High schools with teenagers. Maybe through community colleges. Many are allowed. Already there in some states–within reason–very desirable. Adult community schools should be looked into. This is true now in my state.			
N21 Decisions to end public school educational responsibility will be based flexibly on age, performance on assessments, and readiness to engage in postsecondary school learning activities or the workforce.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
46 Standardized testing of students from preschool through grade 12 will be limited to use in the diagnosis or screening of children with disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=2.90 SD=1.55 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.88 SD=2.00 N=115	
Comments on Item 46: Has some value for screening and then follow-up. Diagnosis and screening will move to curriculum based assessment. Portfolio assessments are already in place in some states. Let's not limit use–low desirability. Curriculum based assessment will probably take over even in identification. Standardized testing is partly political. The disabled will have little influence in this area. I'm not sure I understand this question. It is unrealistic not to consider academic achievement.			
N22 Curriculum based assessment rather than standardized tests will be used to determine educational need for special education services.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
47 There will be a move toward assessment of abilities that are not simply pencil-and-paper tests.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.63 SD=1.04 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.56 SD=0.73 N=115	
Comments on Item 47: Already is, but the paradigm shift seems to be ahead of the technology, and there is a big ... at risk, so probably the movement will			
48 School management of special education services will become increasingly decentralized.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.23 SD=1.34 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.46 SD=1.38 N=114	
Comments on Item 48: I don't know what "management" implies. True for all of education. Together with regular education. Potentially dangerous if left up to local districts. What do you mean? Consistency will be a major issue and accountability. Without educating the "new" decision makers there will be difficulties–not desirable. Appropriate if parental involvement is strong. It already has.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
49 Site-based management will become the standard method of school organization.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.28 SD=1.25 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.43 SD=1.33 N=115	

Comments on Item 49:

Within 20 years we will move to site-based management, it will fail, and we'll rediscover the wheel–not likely or desirable.

This is needed if we are going to implement school reform.

Some services due to their nature cannot be allowed to [be] site-based.

Who's definition of site-based management is being used will determine acceptability and likelihood.

Concept is good, however, administrators and teachers are not prepared. This may lead to failure.

The movement seems to be working pretty well.

I don't really care for it. I use shared decision making at my school anyway.

I'm not sure this business is as "real" as the literature and people's talk make it appear.

It likely will, but it won't make a damn bit of difference in how well kids do those at the sites are just as out of it as those elsewhere, so what's the difference as far as kids are concerned!?!

This is the trend. More is needed but not totally.

50 There will be a continuing emphasis upon prereferral and referral strategies as a means of ~~maintaining the integrity of~~ serving only those with disabilities in the special education system.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.57 SD=1.08 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.84 SD=1.39 N=115	

Comments on Item 50:

This would be good so long as it does not delay the referral of a child suspected of having a disability.

Most prereferral strategies are aimed at avoiding having to comply with federal laws, not to "maintain the integrity" of special education.

A bit unclear. To keep special education as separate? from reg. educ.

This has excellent results.

Better to institutionalize support for teachers.

I'm not sure what you mean by "the integrity of the sp. ed. system." If that means sp. ed. stays exclusive and a part from general ed.–I hope not.

"Integrity" needs definition.

Assumption–"integrity" means that sp. ed. services are reserved for those truly disabled and in need of sp. ed.

Referral to services not means to maintain sp. ed. integrity.

Overall, it hasn't worked too well although they are good practices! The law restricts schools from deciding what can be or should be done for the child's welfare. Due process rights have hindered these strategies.

This presumes a spec. ed. system of some significance.

Not sure I understand "integrity of sp. ed."

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
51 Regular education will become fully accountable for the learning of **all** students.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.04 SD=1.79 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.88 SD=1.56 N=114	

Comments on Item 51:
This is how it should always have worked.
Likely and desirable if needed support mechanisms ARE in place.
Progress will no doubt be made, if school boards, parents administrators and teachers can understand what accountability is.
Does regular education include sp. ed. at this point?
Who dreamed this one up? Regular education has yet to learn what accountability even means!
Highly desirable only if understood appropriately as truly individualized education for all.
General and special will become one.
"Regular ed." term perpetuates the division of kids and responsibility. Perhaps the word "LEA" or school districts should be substituted.

Predictive Statement	Likelihood	Desirability	Additional Comments
52 Special education for children with **mild** disabilities will become a tutorial or remedial program with its specialized interventions related more to what is being taught at the student's ordinary grade level.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.24 SD=1.14 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.21 SD=1.82 N=113	

Comments on Item 52:
Very desirable–provided the needs of these students can best be met in this manner.
This ignores social/ emotional needs and seems targeted exclusively at academics.
Strategies will be the differences.
Need study skills! Learning self-awareness.
??? No score
If this occurs, paraprofessionals can do this.
?ordinary
Only for some children.
I am concerned that "specialized interventions" address the disability and help compensate/accommodate rather than focus on the academics .
This split cannot be mild/ severe, but in terms of instructional needs the statement is right.

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
53 Special education "content" will focus upon ~~the~~ individualized instructional objectives ~~ordinary school curriculum~~ rather than the student's particular diagnosed disability.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.73 SD=1.35 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.83 SD=2.11 N=113	

Comments on Item 53:
It will focus on the school curriculum considering the diagnosed disability.
Way it should be.
Strategies will incorporate the diagnosed disability.
Whatever "ordinary" means
How "desirable" may depend on the disability.
Not always appropriate. Individualization still is an excellent concept.
Ambiguous wording: The mode and goals of teaching have to be individually appropriate.
Compensation and developmental readiness cannot be ignored.
Don't want to teach to deficits, but to not focus on disability would be denying education based on needs.
More dialogue needs to occur–highly desirable.
Should not be either or.
I don't like the options here. Shouldn't be based on either. Should also refer to functional skill needs.

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood**	**Desirability**	**Additional Comments**
54 Special education for children with **moderate** disabilities will become a tutorial or remedial program with its specialized interventions related more to what is being taught at the student's ordinary grade level.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.97 SD=1.33 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.00 SD=1.82 N=113	

Comments on Item 54:
Highly desirable–provided the needs of these students can best be met in this manner.
Remedial continues to imply a deficit model of learning–likely, not desirable.
This ignores social/ emotional needs and seems targeted exclusively at academics.
Must always consider the student's needs not what just available.
Much of the info. taught at the "ordinary grade level" is irrelevant to many students with disabilities. Curricula should be meaningful and relevant to [student] needs.
Answers will differ for high and low incidence disabilities.
This idea breaks down at the high school level. Curriculum far less relevant.
The mode and goals of teaching have to be individually appropriate.
I am concerned that "specialized interventions" address the disability and help compensate/accommodate rather than focus on the academics.
Need more life skills training.
This split cannot be mild/ severe, but in terms of instructional needs the statement is right.
Desirable at elem., not so desirable at jr. and high level.
A move in this direction for moderate or severe will be slow–perhaps more than 20 years.
Compensation and developmental readiness cannot be ignored.

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
55 As schools become more sensitized to the student who is not progressing under "reform activities," there will be growing pressure for special education, with its historical image of "taking anyone" who doesn't succeed in the regular system, to become the general remedial arm of the educational system.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.87 SD=1.37 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=2.84 SD=1.59 N=114	
Comments on Item 55: Desirable only if that means that special education has become a fully integrated component of general education. Reform is going to ignore special needs and within 20 years we will re-invent special education–not desirable. A better definition of disability will happen. As I said earlier, this will happen, but a "new language" should be coined to identify the new type/focus of programming. Special services is a source of excellent strategies or curriculum modifications–different from remediation. I see this as undesirable if the implication is that sp. ed. as a separate system or even "arm" will be responsible for more students. Alternatives must be offered for specialized/ individualized teaching. It may not be called "special education" by then. It has nothing to do with schools' sensitivity to students. It has entirely to do with school's desire to get these kids out of their hair so reg. ed. can continue to teach, uninterrupted, to the middle third of the school population–very likely. Not desirable–special education should be reserved for the students with very special needs. We have some skills and can help and where will the additional resource (e.g., staff, space, time) come from. With support–likely and desirable.			
56 Special education, Chapter I, ESL, and other special programs will become fully merged into one support system to address "differences."	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.52 SD=1.40 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.25 SD=1.71 N=113	
Comments on Item 56: This is read to mean "fully coordinated" to address the needs of the children. Tremendously important. Only if kept as a separate area (i.e., Part I, J, etc.). Not sure what "merged" means. Not sure what this means from a methodological point of view. People use labels to make sense out of reality and the labels create constituencies. They should be. And reg. ed.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
N23 Federal and state regulations will be reworked in IDEA and Chapter I to allow for the blending of special ed. and Ch. I funding and instruction.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
57 As resources become more constrained, special education departments within institutions of higher education will become parts of other general education units.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.00 SD=1.13 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.60 SD=1.77 N=113	
Comments on Item 57: Desirable if it means that general education is incorporating special education. Whether such a "merger" would be desirable cannot be determined without knowing the facts and conditions of each case. Again, special education should "disappear" as a new technology develops. Sp. ed. faculty are the ones who bring money to universities. They aren't going to give that up just to [become] "one of the group." IHEs should model the organizational pattern which fosters inclusive education–highly desirable. Again, movement is evident now–very likely and desirable.			
58 As society grows older and the number of untrained workers increases, special education resources will be reallocated in larger percentages to adult education programs.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.07 SD=1.26 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.50 SD=1.62 N=114	
Comments on Item 58: Should maintain 3-21 funding and add the other. Undesirable if funds are reallocated. Interesting idea, but I think not likely. Look at newer systems. Need to increase funds to cover this area. I really don't know. Don't have a clue. Maybe for milder disabilities. Highly desirable–if not a reallocation but a new allocation.			
59 Increased longevity will demand the expansion of services and additional support for older citizens with disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.74 SD=1.04 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.20 SD=0.87 N=114	
Comments on Item 59: Of course. Because public agencies are largely involved with these services, funding will always be delimited.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
60 Children with **severe** disabilities needing special education services will more than double due to increased social problems, drug exposure, AIDS infections, and medical and technological advances.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.50 SD=1.28 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.96 SD=1.47 N=112	

Comments on Item 60:
We need better training and education programs to avoid many of the social problems.
This depends on national health insurance which we will have in 20 years.
We don't want more children with severe disabilities. How will abortion affect?
We need to advocate for prevention.
Unwise and unnecessary medical procedures to protect doctors from malpractice increase severe disabilities–not desirable.
Will increase–is already. Not sure of % increase projections.
If the need is present the service should be available.
The expectation is that there would be better intervention programs.
The desirability of this is an area of concern: Should technology be used to improve the quality of life–yes; is it desirable to have increased numbers of children with severe disabilities due to social problems–no.
Increase by "X"%, double is too high a figure. Research this percentage.
I suspect so. It's a guess, at best.
Will certainly increase, but double? I'm not sure
It's not desirable for this number to increase but we know it will.
Don't know whether we have any choice in this matter.

61 Genetic engineering and other medical advances will prevent many disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.73 SD=1.53 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.35 SD=1.02 N=113	

Comments on Item 61:
We need basic training in society to recognize differences–there will always be differences.
Maybe not in 20 years but it's coming.
Depends on how the Right-to-Life movement plays out, among a host of other things.
Technology will prevent disabilities; however, access to the technology is the problem.
Unless the "orphan" drugs and such research generates sufficient profit, this will not occur!
Medical advances, yes. Genetic engineering is questionable for me.
"Many" some disabilities.
Highly desirable–if is is done with sensitivity to needs of families and people with disabilities.
One can only hope.
Ability to apply prevention technologies has not been demonstrated well in the past.
Medical advances often have opposite effect (i.e., a life is saved where previously it would be even lost).
Yes, if only others will not take their place–likely and desirable.

<table>
<tr><th>Predictive Statement</th><th>Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)</th><th>Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)</th><th>Additional Comments</th></tr>
<tr><td>62 The regular education system will become more able ~~dependent upon~~ to utilize the techniques, expertise, and specialized knowledge in the discipline of special education.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=5.03
SD=1.34
N=115</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=5.86
SD=1.49
N=115</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comments on Item 62:
Reg. ed. needs to be trained now (as part of the typical program of students) in meeting the needs of children with disabilities.
In an integrated system.
A team process.
Will be difficult due to current mind sets.
Currently happening without giving credit to special education.
Not become more dependent–hopefully would embrace and utilize the special expertise offered by sp. ed.
Regular ed. should not be "dependent" on sp. ed.–more desirable to form a partnership.
Dependent–hopefully not, more collaborative and cooperative–highly desirable.
dependent?
We need to watch against too much micro-teaching which sp. ed. espouses a lot. Regular ed. provides a good balance.
This is desirable up to a point, but ultimately the ability of general ed. to deal with diversity should increase.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>63 Special education services, research, and training will focus on contributing to the general societal welfare, rather than on a more narrow unique population.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=4.56
SD=1.26
N=113</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=5.32
SD=1.63
N=114</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comments on Item 63:
This would be desirable so long as the needs of the students are met.
You suggest that "special education" will focus on people with severe disabilities–if so, development ... and support should also be focused thusly.
Not sure what "contributing to" means in these three contexts.
Unclear question–I noted you left out resources so I think it desirable. If resources had been included answer would have been different.
A little confusion in this statement. I think the growth in R & D, service development will slow down for severely disabled and speed up for "at risk" populations.
Not "rather than" but "in addition to."
Not to the exclusion of meeting the needs of kids with disabilities. However, a broadening of interest and impact will be appropriate.
Don't know about this.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>N24 Program development and instructional research will shift from a focus on severe and moderate populations to a focus on at risk and mild disabilities.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood**: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability**: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
64 Federal education program funding will more flexibly allow governors, school administrators, teachers, service providers, parents, and communities to work together to develop effective education programs.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.98 SD=1.36 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.28 SD=1.09 N=115	
Comments on Item 64: This would be desirable so long as the needs of the students are met. Flexibility = waivers = discrimination. Less restrictions, yes. No, greater quantity of $'s however! Special education services do not always continue to be a priority in some leadership positions. Highly desirable–I don't think it blocks it now. Will we loose the baby and bath water, too?			
65 National standards and certification of special education teachers will become a reality and teachers certified in one state will be able to receive national certification and be hired in any state in the union.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.50 SD=1.54 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.06 SD=1.35 N=115	
Comments on Item 65: If professional organizations become as well organized as ASHA. Flexibility needed because of diverse geography and service patterns. May develop as an option, like ASHA certification–doubt if there will be any type of nationalization of education within the next generation. Highly desirable–if criteria are stringent enough. More likely and desirable done on regional basis. Just try moving to a new state and get a license. I hope! At last, hopefully! If internships are included in the certification requirements for sp. ed. teachers, OK.			
N25 Teacher certification will equate to teacher skill.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.0 SD=0.0 N=1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	

Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
66 Mental health services will be integrated in the school setting providing on-site support for children with disabilities, parents and teachers.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.65 SD=1.32 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.35 SD=1.10 N=115	
Comments on Item 66: Let's focus on education and try not to splinter resources and goals–not desirable! Highly desirable–if M. H. services are effective and if M. H. funds are used, not an add on to educations' responsibilities. Extremely important and desirable. We have a therapy/ consultation program at my school and it is ideal. Parents are relaxed and feel comfortable coming to meet with a therapist–likely and very desirable. Or a community setting–likely and desirable. Mixed feelings about how far we can push schools as the "all purpose" social agency. WOW!! –highly desirable.			
67 Employment opportunities for people with disabilities will decrease.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.47 SD=1.46 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.63 SD=1.59 N=115	
Comments on Item 67: Yes–will be less entry-level jobs and more competition. There are decreases for everybody. Driven by economic necessity more than social conscience. It should increase.			
68 Crisis intervention for all children will be made available through the reallocation of the tasks of specialized personnel, now largely dedicated to assessment and evaluation for special education.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.48 SD=1.27 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.74 SD=1.52 N=115	
Comments on Item 68: Realistic case loads and reassignment of responsibilities will determine availability and effectiveness. Any child not performing at grade level will become a "crisis" and no longer a reg. ed. responsibility. Important, but not reallocation, but additional allocation. It's pretty tough to make an interventionist out of a psychometrician! Requirements by law preclude this from happening.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
69 The federal research focus will be shaped by priorities identified in the annual reports to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disability Education Act (IDEA).	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.47 SD=1.28 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.60 SD=1.63 N=113	
Comments on Item 69: It should not be limited to only this area. Pressure groups will control congress–not research. Other factors must be considered. Desirable if sufficiently enlightened. The report is too contrived–too many special interest editors. I'm not sure the annual report to Congress says anything that congress could use to focus research! How the priorities are determined is more important than where they are reported. Need to account for emerging priorities, anticipated but, not yet identified nationally. Political. Decisions not always sound motivation. I lack confidence in the accuracy of this data source. High desirability depends on who will set the priorities.			
70 School systems will adopt numerous nontraditional methods (e.g., out-of-school, on-the-street, in-the-neighborhood activities) to involve parents in their children's special education program.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.87 SD=1.31 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.14 SD=1.00 N=115	
Comments on Item 70: Through interagency team concepts. We need to be careful to preserve parents' responsibilities as well as rights. They need to feel responsible and take initiative to participate.			
71 States will adopt performance-based intervention/takeover plans for local districts that are not achieving measurable criteria ~~with special education students~~.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.14 SD=1.46 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.88 SD=1.62 N=113	
Comments on Item 71: Who will choose the criteria to measure? Difficult to project–depends on individual situations. Highly desirable for all students but not selective students. Not sure [whether] this is a solution or a big problem. This will occur across the board–not just special ed.–highly likely and desirable. Appears to contradict restructuring concept but may be necessary.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
72 Special education placement will be determined using computerized decision-making (expert) systems as an aid to placement teams.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.42 SD=1.41 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.66 SD=1.92 N=115	
Comments on Item 72: Not enough information to determine. More information such as the degree of individualization is needed. Depends on how it is used to "aid" the team. Children are still too unique for computerized placements. We need to learn to work as teams first. Maybe in about a hundred years! Only useful if very well designed. Research is not at this level at this point by any means! Nice technology, but placement success is more a function of will than of science. Likely, but limitations to computerized approach make this undesirable. Desirable if used as an aid, but not for sole reliance on decision making.			
73 States will be required to develop new family-centered services, such as at-home crisis intervention and specially-trained foster families to meet the needs of children who are seriously emotionally disturbed.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.62 SD=1.36 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.00 SD=1.10 N=114	
Comments on Item 73: States, in general, or SEAs? Required by whom? Orwell was right, just taking a little longer than 1984. May happen, but I don't think "requirements" are going to be as common in next 20 years. Desirable as long as "states" are not limited to SEAs but includes other state agencies.			
74 The mismatch between the skills graduates with disabilities possess and the requirements of tomorrow's jobs will continue to grow.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.79 SD=1.24 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.60 SD=1.15 N=114	
Comments on Item 74: ? Suggest deleting "with disabilities possess" from the statement. As will the mismatch between skills of nondisabled and job requirements. We (special educators) would seem pretty stupid if it does!			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
75 The number of special education students dropping out of school will double as academic standards rise and social problems intensify.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.05 SD=1.29 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.25 SD=0.61 N=114	
Comments on Item 75: Not if we do our job well. Depends on program reform and objectives. May have some difficulty with the mild population but not the moderate and severe.			
76 The discrepancy between the proportion of persons with diverse cultural backgrounds in the special education teaching population and those in the special education student population will decrease signficantly.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.91 SD=1.39 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.09 SD=1.41 N=114	
Comments on Item 76: No idea! Reality limits the rating of this item. Skill and training are more important than cultural match. This issue is currently being addressed with potential success.			
77 States will implement alternative routes to special education certification as a solution to teacher shortages.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.67 SD=0.91 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.17 SD=1.97 N=114	
Comments on Item 77: The need is there. What else can you do? But necessary the way funding is handled in some states. Depends on the routes and how it is done. Teacher certification? Sp. ed. services may decrease.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
78 Life-long learning will generate birth-to-death ~~curricula~~ learning opportunities and delivery systems for persons with and without disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.44 SD=1.65 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.88 SD=1.30 N=114	
Comments on Item 78: Perhaps generating opportunities rather than "curricula" would be a better option. Not by the schools. But will the education system be the vehicle for delivery? Life-long learning should be a goal for all people. Remember Bob Audette's "Lust to dust" model? Nobody took him seriously, either. This probably isn't a "program." If it happens, it will be result of a change in social norms. Terminology problem–is it the curricula, learning process, or access to either that is life long? Funding will be a source of problems. Cost considerations make this unrealistic.			
79 Vocational education classes will be made available for all youth with disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.78 SD=1.51 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.47 SD=0.95 N=114	
Comments on Item 79: You mean it isn't now? Voc ed. as we know it will be discontinued–not likely or desirable. Presuming this is what they need–some students with disabilities may not require it. Some improvement may occur, but it may take court action. Depends on meaning of Voc. ed. –desirable.			
80 Employment options for persons with disabilities will increase by at least one-third as a result of advances in assistive technology.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.84 SD=1.24 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.64 SD=0.74 N=115	
Comments on Item 80: Hopefully more! The increase will probably be seen for individuals with physical disabilities–emotional and cognitive disabilities probably far less impact. Technology often decreases options for all. Cost considerations are an issue.			
81 The federal role in policy making for children and youth with disabilities will decrease.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.72 SD=1.67 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.03 SD=1.98 N=115	
Comments on Item 81: Not even if Reagan returns.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
82 Educational programs for children and youth with disabilities will become substantially deregulated.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.87 SD=1.48 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.07 SD=1.88 N=115	
Comments on Item 82: The desirability of this depends on the facts and circumstances and how well the procedural safeguards are retained. At present time regulation seems the only way services are provided in many schools. Only if the lobby and its bed-fellows (bed-peoples?) go away. Pros and cons to that–big time! Districts who lack the integrity to serve all children will ensure this not happening. Deregulated from what? Risks of loss and gain by deregulation are about equal. Depends! Quality assurance is key. We have got to keep some regs or program quality will suffer. Again, lobbying groups for sp. ed. will prevent substantial deregulation.			
83 Special education service delivery patterns will be oriented to family and child needs and not disciplinary interests and service traditions.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.64 SD=1.38 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.22 SD=1.11 N=115	
Comments on Item 83: Need to breakdown turf and funding boundaries first. Sure hope so. I feel all aspects of service should do this. Highly desirable–we've been edging in this direction for about 80 years.			

Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
84 Special education services will be contracted to the agency/school (public or private) that has demonstrated the ability to deliver them most cost effectively and with comparable quality.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.16 SD=1.38 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.30 SD=1.76 N=115	
Comments on Item 84: One needs to know the level of program effectiveness. Cost should not be the determining factor unless one is comparing the same quality program. Cost shouldn't be only factor. The 20 year federal history of attempts at performance contracting leave me with no confidence. "Cost effectively" does not always equate with quality. Low bid doesn't ensure quality. Most effectively–effective service vs. cheap. Cost effectiveness should not be the #1 priority. School districts not delivering should be penalized with extra support given to contracted schools. Depends on a lot of factors like like location, etc. May be in conflict with LRE, because of economy of scale issues. Provided the services have been evaluated for quality. Include the variable of high quality/ cost effective. No mention of the quality of services offered. Does this statement imply that economics and not program quality are (will be) driving service delivery? Depends on where biggest quality is assured if so, then by all means. Not in my state.			
N26 The ability of schools (public or private) to deliver quality education consistent with what the state has validated will be realized.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.0 SD=0.0 N=1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
85 Increased ~~stress~~ emphasis on life-long learning and employment will force greater integration of services between schools and human service agencies for people with disabilities 18 years and beyond.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.29 SD=1.11 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.45 SD=0.79 N=114	
Comments on Item 85: I may be pessimistic–there do appear to be more examples of workable interagency collaboration particularly in mental health-related areas. Likelihood high since transition efforts will make this a reality. For the severely disabled, this is a reality. Change "stress" to "emphasis." Funding priorities will need to change for this to be implemented.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood**: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability**: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
86 When multiple agencies/programs are involved with services for a child with a disability, a single plan will be developed with input from each of the major agencies/ programs providing the service to the child and family.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.92 SD=1.35 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.44 SD=0.90 N=115	
Comments on Item 86: Is currently occurring for some students with disabilities. My experience has indicated that these "plans" are largely a waste of time as schools are only agencies mandated to serve–not desirable. Probably–one sort of "sniffs it in the breeze" of 99-457, etc. The involvement of social services agencies in certain program areas (0-2) hurts the educational potential of young children with disabilities.			
87 A single monitoring system will be developed for evaluating each special education student's progress across different service delivery systems.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.24 SD=1.53 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.96 SD=1.34 N=115	
Comments on Item 87: Not enough information. I don't think the system will change so (...in 20 yrs) but when it does, this obviously will follow.			
88 Outcome measures for special education services will be better defined thus enhancing their use for teacher and school system evaluation.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.27 SD=1.15 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.36 SD=0.98 N=114	
Comments on Item 88: Each child is so unique there is no easy formula. I sure hope so–we've never really done it before. We already know what they are, but no one bothers to use them. I see nothing happening to knock their use off dead center! I'd rather see outcome measures for ed.–not limited to sp. ed. Don't like the idea of evaluating teachers with this system unless other variables are controlled or accounted for–not desirable. Teacher and school evaluation are two very different things.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
89 Instruction of children and youth with disabilities will increasingly occur in natural environments and situations.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.35 SD=1.00 N=112	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.44 SD=0.72 N=112	
Comments on Item 89: Does this mean "outdoors"? What's the matter with the classroom? [natural environments and situations] Natural does not necessarily mean regular classroom. I suspect we will redefine natural environments–likely and desirable. Not sure what is meant. This is unclear to me as to what is meant by a natural environment/ situation.			
90 Technological advances will enable the design of learning and living environments that substantially reduce functional limitations resulting from sensory and physical disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.68 SD=1.01 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.73 SD=0.60 N=114	
91 High school diplomas or certificates of completion will be awarded to students with disabilities who satisfactorily complete their IEP goals in the 12th grade or at age 21.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.16 SD=1.53 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.74 SD=1.64 N=114	
Comments on Item 91: Are the diplomas "regular"? Does the "or" mean you're graduating after 12th grade even if you're under 21? I assume you are talking about diplomas and not certificates–not likely or desirable. This is happening in my school district. Diplomas should be awarded at time of completion of IEP–not at age 21–where age is the only criteria. Probably won't because the ...priority. Issue re conveying skill level to potential employers. Diplomas would not have specific meaning if this were true–highly undesirable. Assuming "good" IEPs. This is a double edged sword. Why call them HS diplomas? Emphasis on such "rewards" needs to decrease! Either a diploma or some other exit document. The issuance of certificates of attendance or equivalents as opposed to H.S. diplomas will probably be maintained unless the student with a disability elects to enroll in the diploma track. This is policy in our state now–highly likely and desirable.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
92 Certificates of completion for students with disabilities not in the diploma track will be considered a satisfactory means of meeting the National Educational Goal of graduating at least 90 percent of high school students.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.84 SD=1.56 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.33 SD=2.15 N=113	
Comments on Item 92: Not enough information. If C of Cs are awarded only to disabled students. This national educational goal will be gone in 20 yrs. Certificates for whom? I have no response for this. I don't know. This is a double edged sword. Why call them HS diplomas? Emphasis on such "rewards" needs to decrease! Unfortunately true. Assuming such certificates are based on IEP–type plans.			
N27 The concept of "diploma" will be replaced by a list of competencies attained at the time of school completion.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.5 SD=0.5 N=2	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=2	
N28 School completion credentials will document learning experiences and demonstrated performance on standard tasks and challenges.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
93 There will be a significant growth in research that focuses on the cost effectiveness and efficacy ~~efficiency~~ of various instructional strategies in educating children and youth with disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.26 SD=1.19 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.80 SD=1.41 N=115	
Comments on Item 93: Not sure I understand the statement in terms of what that means for any one child. There are more "costs" than just dollars–not desirable. Must define efficiency–desirable. Not desirable without considering efficacy. Probably not due to lobby against. This is a pseudo-business language applied to issues (outcomes for students) that are only partly instructional problems. What would really be nice would be for us to use the research we have!			
94 Increased research efforts will focus on early identification and diagnosis of emotional problems in infants and toddlers.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.15 SD=1.15 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.92 SD=1.26 N=115	
Comments on Item 94: We can identify factors now–what do we do about it ? Include their families since they are so interrelated.			
95 Policy changes will occur to make health care universally available for families of young children with disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.98 SD=1.53 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.76 SD=0.49 N=115	
Comments on Item 95: Everybody, looks like. How about just "universally available"? We need it badly.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
96 The fragmented services provided by different agencies will be transformed into a comprehensive, multidisciplinary, interagency coordinated system of services to meet the needs of children and youth with disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 ǀ 5 6 7 X=4.32 SD=1.61 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 ǀ 7 X=6.62 SD=0.81 N=115	
Comments on Item 96: Let the schools be the service coordinators–we do it anyway. Just give us the funds! Very, very desirable. This is a must! "Mechanism" problems–how do you do that? Not by redesigning the myriad organizations, I think.			
97 Special education litigation will decline.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 ǀ 4 5 6 7 X=3.16 SD=1.50 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 ǀ 7 X=6.12 SD=1.40 N=115	
Comments on Item 97: Litigation is the only thing that has made the system move as far as it has. Litigation caused the EHA. Federal monitoring and the OCR have been lackluster at best and are currently in retreat. Without litigation there would be no enforcement–not likely or desirable. It may be a necessary evil. Likely only if regulations change. Special education litigation will decline only if funding and services drastically improve. Desirable if need declines Depends on performance. Depends on why. It has caused positive changes and could continue–likely but not desirable. Only if reg. educators are aware of responsibilities and if parents are educated and participants in process–very desirable. This is a real sore spot for LEAs. There needs to be some control or deregulation in this area of due process. It directly contributes to teachers and administrator drain in the educational system. Desirable if this means better services. Unsure. If needs are being met, reduced litigation is desirable. If not, then we need to continue it.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
98 States will establish performance-based accountability systems by linking school finance at the local level with achievement of specific outcome measures of special education students.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.94 SD=1.36 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.32 SD=1.78 N=114	
Comments on Item 98: I do not agree with further segregation of children. I'm not sure this would benefit students if money motive took precedence. This was tried successfully in 1968-71 in twenty states, but politically it was unpopular and was cancelled. It will be tried again and will again be shelved. We put money into failure, not into achievement. It is politically impossible to abandon failures and reward success. It is an educational equivalent of the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. Doubtful. Finance and achievement can't always fit and give outcomes. Only if reasonable outcomes and related measures are developed. Not desirable–too mechanistic. It will never happen until "achievement" has been defined. I don't see anyone with the "guts" to challenge local control unless significantly mandated. Don't like the idea of evaluating teachers with this system unless other variables are controlled or accounted for.			
99 Special education teachers will be required to demonstrate competence in bilingual education instructional procedures or, at a minimum, English as a second language instructional techniques.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.85 SD=1.42 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.76 SD=1.56 N=115	
Comments on Item 99: Desirable because many bilingual students already misplaced in sp. ed.–there will be increasing #'s of bilingual students. Determined by the area needs. It's very difficult to find teachers who are fully trained in a given EEN area. This is often not a need in many areas of the country. Collaboration with ESL specialists may be more viable. Desirable in some areas of US but not all. Not all teachers necessarily but still likely and desirable. How is the big question. Right problem–wrong solution? Not convinced that this should be an across the board requirement. I hope not since the implication is that bilingualism is best served in sp. ed.–would rather recruit bilingual teachers, aides, etc.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
100 Preservice education will be reconceptualized so that all educators and administrators are prepared to work with the full range of students in inclusive settings.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.44 SD=1.55 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.40 SD=1.11 N=115	
Comments on Item 100: I'd exclude the most extreme portions of the bell curve. Turf problems are growing only worse! Reg. ed. is terrorized at being taught anything by sp. ed. This will not be true of high school teachers and others. Use of the word "all" brought both scores down. "Full range" is not possible "wider range" very desirable. Probably not too important for severely disabled. I don't know what you mean by inclusive settings.			
N29 Training of regular educators will expand to include skills necessary to serve students with mild disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
101 The learning disability and emotionally disturbed categories will be divided into mild, moderate, and severe levels.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.44 SD=1.37 N=112	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.38 SD=1.88 N=112	
Comments on Item 101: I'm not sure this has any relevance?? Once we're good enough to tell the difference. More desirable to have mild, mod. severe across disability areas. Diagnostic categories mean almost nothing so far as instruction is concerned, so what difference does it make? Probably should focus on item #102. They already are for teachers. Should we report it? Maybe. Should we label kids "severe LD"–NO! Double edge sword. Labeling doesn't appear to be an issue–services are! Perhaps 2 categories: mild and severe, but I don't think there will be three levels.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
102 Categorical delivery of services will be abolished in favor of noncategorical programs (excluding students with sensory impairments) ~~for mild, moderate, and severe levels of disability.~~	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.56 SD=1.38 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.08 SD=1.83 N=115	

Comments on Item 102:
I agree with the noncategorical programs, but do not wish to see students further segregated/ classified.
This needs to occur.!!
Especially visually and hearing impaired as well as multi-sensory impaired.
Desirable for LD, ED, LI, etc. Still need for categories in Deaf, VI, DB due to uniqueness of skills.
Think of a different "label" or none. Think of the service rather than the label of the student.
Who cares? This kind of stuff is an administrative shell game that does nothing to improve instruction!
Can't eliminate all categories because some instruction (e.g., sensory impaired) really IS different. There is a real technology of instruction not practiced by "reg. ed. teachers."
Individualized instruction is necessary–the labels mild, mod. severe are potentially very dangerous.
Categorical services are not desirable.
We should not do away with categorical programs completely.
Not sure I really like this one.
There will continue to be categorical areas in vision, hearing, and speech.

103 Categorical certification in special education will be replaced with generic certification which will allow a teacher to serve children with **mild** to **moderate** levels of disability (excluding sensory impairments).	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.87 SD=1.32 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.27 SD=1.75 N=115	

Comments on Item 103:
There are pluses and minuses both ways–some students.
This needs to occur!!
What about severe–again VI, HI, and MSI need specific training–not desirable
Who cares? This kind of stuff is an administrative shell game that does nothing to improve instruction!
Can't eliminate all categories because some instruction (e.g., sensory impaired) really IS different. There is a real technology of instruction not practiced by "reg. ed. teachers."
But speciality training is highly necessary!
Current system in my state–it does not need to drive service delivery–but can if allowed.
Speech would have a hard time with this.
Already happening.
Yes, but don't do away with completely.
Mild etc. is not correct division–specific instructional needs of students and skills or teachers are better.
Certification range is too great to be realistic.
There will continue to be categorical areas in vision, hearing, and speech.

<table>
<tr><th>Predictive Statement</th><th>Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)</th><th>Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)</th><th>Additional Comments</th></tr>
<tr><td>104 Categorical certification in special education will be replaced with generic certification which will allow a teacher to serve children with severe disabilities.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=4.40
SD=1.49
N=115</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=4.51
SD=1.95
N=115</td><td rowspan="4"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comments on Item 104:
Likelihood great because of teacher shortages in severe.
This needs to occur!!
Why separate from 103?
Who cares? This kind of stuff is an administrative shell game that does nothing to improve instruction!
Can't eliminate all categories because some instruction (e.g., sensory impaired) really IS different. There is a real technology of instruction not practiced by "reg. ed. teachers."
Potentially very dangerous, although partially on the right track.
Current system in my state–it does not need to drive service delivery–but can if allowed.
Mild etc. is not correct division–specific instructional needs of students and skills or teachers are better.
There will continue to be categorical areas in vision, hearing, and speech.</td></tr>
<tr><td>105 Categorical federal funding for students with disabilities will be abolished in favor of a noncategorical funding system.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=4.40
SD=1.54
N=115</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=5.25
SD=1.82
N=113</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comments on Item 105:
Only positive if people dispensing the funds do not overlook certain children. There still needs to be a monitoring system.
The ADD fight to get into the categories shows the political fight that will occur if categories are abolished–not likely, but desirable.
A hopeful!
This needs to occur!!
VI, HI, MSI need categorical funding.
This has been in the futures since about 1976, hasn't it?
Funding should be provided as an incentive for inclusive programs.
Already have it, but will be revised to be based on census–very likely and desirable
Who cares? This kind of stuff is an administrative shell game that does nothing to improve instruction!
Confusing–IDEA funding is noncategorical in the sense that it doesn't matter what you call a "student with a disability"–you still get $300 per kid.
Loss of vision may loose children, too!
Statement is unclear–federal funding does not require disability categories now.
Depends if the new system is able to direct funding stream to the sp. ed. needs.</td></tr>
</table>

Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
N30 Special categorical funding will exist but only for certain categories of disability (e.g., Deaf Blind) that are so low in prevalence they could be lost in the shuffle and lose big.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
N31 Inclusive programs will generate increased funding.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
106 Access to life-long learning opportunities will be available for all people with disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 | 5 6 7 X=4.48 SD=1.46 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 7 X=6.65 SD=0.62 N=115	
Comments on Item 106: Likelihood depends on whether this is publicly funded.			
107 The expansion of ungraded elementary schools will drastically reduce referrals of students with **mild** disabilities to special education programs at the primary grade levels.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 | 5 6 7 X=4.57 SD=1.36 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 | 6 7 X=5.90 SD=1.22 N=115	
Comments on Item 107: Ungraded elem. schools are not necessarily the answer if the net effect is that the child repeats the grade over and over This is desirable so long as it does not delay a child receiving the services they need. Plus other things–cooperative learning, integrating curriculum. Not certain about first part of question. This would be highly desirable if the child were being served adequately in regular education. This could make the problem less visible and this would be harmful. "Gradedness" has nothing whatsoever to do with kids being identified as "not smart" and once they are, the system is out to get that kid out. Teacher training in individualized instruction is mandatory. I hope this happens!			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
108 Grade retention for students with disabilities will be drastically reduced in elementary and middle grades.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.80 SD=1.27 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.13 SD=1.16 N=115	
Comments on Item 108: Hopefully, I do not allow retention at my school. Yet this may be counterproductive!			
109 Coordination of service delivery instead of the delivery of direct services will become the primary role of special educators.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.49 SD=1.19 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.73 SD=1.65 N=115	
Comments on Item 109: This is desirable so long as it does not delay a child receiving the services they need. Some combination may be necessary. "Coordination or facilitation"... Not the only role. In the classroom or within school district? So who will be there to educate the children with the special requirements. For some, but not all. Why special ed.–just let general ed. assume responsibility. We will still need teachers doing teaching. "Fair share" of duties among the teacher ranks will be a problem, particularly in full inclusion classes.			
110 Schools will become the brokers of a comprehensive, interagency system of services for students with disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.76 SD=1.33 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.84 SD=1.11 N=115	
Comments on Item 110: If it happens at all, schools will be the broker. Just give schools the necessary funds to do the job! Broker–yes–for the right reasons. Not to be held accountable, however. Would be one example of a more functional system design than we now have. Schools have all the kids so it makes sense. Should be for all students.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
111 Special education personnel will provide a case management service in addition to instruction or coordination of services.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.17 SD=1.06 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.80 SD=1.26 N=112	
Comments on Item 111: Very desirable and already being done. Case management term may be too broad, need specifics to rate desirability Responsibility should be primarily with reg. teachers.–supported by sp. ed. Case management and coordination of services are the same concepts. Sp. ed. better never get out of the business of direct instruction of kids. Case management recognize Medicaid. Great concept if time will be permitted for a complete job.			
112 There will be an insufficient number of certified special educators to provide direct services to students with disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.64 SD=1.33 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.94 SD=1.50 N=114	
Comments on Item 112: Certification standards will change–not very likely. Somewhat desirable as it may force change. I feel the current shortage of special education teachers is short term.			
113 There will be an insufficient number of qualified special education administrators at the national, state, and local levels to provide adequate leadership to the field.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.18 SD=1.55 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.97 SD=1.49 N=115	
Comments on Item 113: There is a high rate of burnout in this profession. We need education leaders for all pupils, not special education administrators. Unless something is done regarding due process, we will continue to see an outflow of sp. ed. teachers and administrators at the LEA level.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
114 Parents and students with disabilities will become the primary determiners of placement and services provided by special education.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.91 SD=1.30 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.68 SD=1.72 N=113	
Comments on Item 114: They should be involved but NOT to the extent stated here. And their lawyers! Equally shared between parents, students, and teachers. Public education system has limitations to resources (i.e., not Mercedes just a Chevy). Does this assume functional participation by parents in the IEP process? Very desirable–but a great deal of parent empowerment education will need to be done if this is to happen. IEP process is good as a group process. Parents (sadly) do not always act in the best interest of their children.			
115 Parents will have the power to veto IEPs.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.36 SD=1.50 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.38 SD=1.87 N=113	
Comments on Item 115: They have some veto power now. Veto too strong a concept.–Is this legally binding? In reality, parents already have this power–not at all desirable. They do now. They do already Denial of disability! Challenge, yes. Veto, no. That would be too dangerous for too many kids. Parents are in an awkward position many times of a new awareness and learning experience. Doubt if the due process protections will change. Already do with the recinding of accepting services. Parents always have this right. Only as a team member Does this assume functional participation by parents in the IEP process? To an extent, they do now. Board of Education of Community Consolidated School District 21 v. Brozer will provide the test. Parents are getting more conscious of their rights. Costs of mediation and due process takes away from possible services to students. They do now in terms of requesting a hearing and that is perceived as so negative to many districts that they simply cave in. They currently have this right as the parent and school representative must agree or go to due process to resolve. They do now. Have that now! Within the constraints of due process.			

Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
N32 Paraprofessionals will assume a more direct role in the instruction of children with disabilities.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.0 SD=0.0 N=1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
116 Special education teacher preparation schools will no longer be at institutions of higher education but will be located within public schools.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.25 SD=1.18 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.89 SD=1.82 N=115	

Comments on Item 116:

Mentor programs should not replace formal instruction–some combination best. Schools don't have ability to take over entire function.

Partnerships, not an either/ or.

This would be interesting.

A blend is necessary. Universities must be a part, but practitioners and ongoing inservice must be paramount!

This would allow for "real world" preparation of special educators–very desirable.

All teacher preparation schools should be lab schools.

There is a trend toward site-managed inservice, ...certification, but I doubt schools will ever grant degrees.

Certification protection from litigation will not allow this.

Some is ok, all is bad.

Not desirable–of course practical fellowships, internships etc need to be in the public school

A strong partnership between higher ed. and the schools/ interagency collaboration.

Higher ed. lobby is too strong!!

Not just special education but all of education's teacher training programs. Instructors should be practitioners and this statement indicates that this would be so (to me).

Would welcome a return to a lab school model for teacher preparation.

It would be good if we could be sure they can do an adequate job of teacher training at the institution before they simply transport crummy programs to the schools. Crummy is crummy, whether on campus or in a public school building.

Strong internship programs should be developed if resistance to this idea occurs.

Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
N33 Entrance to teacher preparation programs will begin at the post baccalaureate level and will consist of at least two years of specialized training; the last being a year long residency (internship) at a school site.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
117 Special education teachers as a part of site-based management teams will assume new responsibilities for ~~education and will have control~~ of building-based curriculum, funds, and the methods and means of instruction.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 | 4 5 6 7 X=3.54 SD=1.43 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 | 5 6 7 X=4.37 SD=1.56 N=115	

Comments on Item 117:

Teachers should be part of process but others such as administrators must be also part of process with assistance from regular education teachers.

Will be consistent with education in general–very likely and desirable.

Teams.

They have this now in many places.

Assume new responsibility, yes! Have ultimate control? No!

Site-based management will promote a broadened participation.

Have not demonstrated they are trained to be in this position even in Site-Based Management.

They should be part of site-based team.

By themselves?

Change to site-base management teams including teachers and parents and it rates a 7 in desirability.

With their gen. ed. counterparts–very desirable.

Then they wouldn't be teachers but rather teacher-administrators.

I don't see much control of the salary funds. All other things are probably being controlled by them presently.

In collaboration with regular education??

New responsibilities in education–very likely and desirable.

	Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
118a	At the school level, decisions regarding staffing will be made collaboratively by teachers (special and regular educators), administrators, and parents.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.34 SD=1.29 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.95 SD=1.64 N=114	

Comments on Item 118a:
And parents.
Decisions regarding staffing will be made by teachers. They will probably not hire and carry out administrative functions.
Teachers must focus on teaching. It should be shared responsibility and different roles... Team vs. hierarchy preferred.
Would be the wrong approach, I think–a collegial model would be more likely.
Add parents and the likelihood and desirability would be 7's.
Will they be compensated financially for performing those tasks?
Then they wouldn't be teachers but rather teacher-administrators.
Hopefully, restructuring will not only involve the teachers in these decision making processes. There should at least be a council consisting of other segments of the community. etc.

118b	Teachers (special and regular educators), will hire personnel to carry out administrative functions.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=2.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=2.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
119	Existing boards of education will be replaced by planning teams comprised of educators, and people from family services, business, and community support centers, as well as parents and other family members.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.14 SD=1.39 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.56 SD=1.69 N=115	

Comments on Item 119:
Not likely within next 20 years.
Very doubtful if this will, and certainly doubtful whether it should.
Public will not buy this change–at least in our area.
Not a shred of evidence existing that assures us that planning teams are any better at running school districts than are schools' boards of education!
Likely–seems to be the movement.

Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
120 Efforts will bring about the unification of education focused on meeting the needs of all children rather than a parallel system based on labeling and separation of students with differing abilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.74 SD=1.36 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.45 SD=1.07 N=114	
Comments on Item 120: For most children not necessarily all. Our future!!! Very likely and desirable. Will be movement, I think. Don't care if a student is labeled or not–but is receiving appropriate services to meet individual needs based on some learning plan. Great, if we could do it but much easier said than done. I do not agree that there is a dual or parallel system now–is this broad enough to do away with system of grades 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc.			
N34 A unitary education system will be created that abolishes separate and often parallel policies for special and regular education.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
N35 Universities will provide unitary teacher training programs for special and regular education teachers that focus on instructional strategies that meet the needs of all children.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
N36 Special education will be blended into global education to the point where "special" is invisible–replaced by a capable comprehensive instructional support system for ALL students.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	

Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
121 The primary role of special educators will be to provide support to the general education teachers' efforts to ensure success in their classrooms.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.94 SD=1.19 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.93 SD=1.32 N=115	

Comments on Item 121:
This could be desirable provided the needs of sp. ed. students are appropriately met.
Definitely heading that way, may make it there in 20 years if strong force (e.g., legislation) behind it. Look at VT Act 230.
One role only?
Already is to a large extent.
Define clearly what support means.
Too broad a category for good consensus.
Again quality and quantity of time.
It needs to be the role of many teachers–not all.
Highly desirable–for most students with disabilities.
Moving that way, but would like to see research results.
This will be one role, but not the sole role.
Again, fair share of duties makes this questionable. I personally feel that this could be a big waste of money.
Some direct service seems inevitable and desirable.
In some cases–particularly mild disabilities.

122 Special educators will be included in all school-based management systems at schools.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.84 SD=1.42 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.43 SD=0.91 N=115	
123 The primary focus of special education will move from "cure or remediation" to prevention.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.97 SD=1.47 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.44 SD=1.55 N=114	

Comments on Item 123:
"Cure and remediation," however, should not be eliminated.
For many children and disabilities prevention is not an issue that can be dealt with.
Beyond the scope of the school in many cases.
It will need to be an equal blend of both.
One should not be neglected for the other. There is a need for both focus areas. Both are essentially important.
Some students will still need "cure or remediation" such as autism or ED.
Really a pre-natal and preschool/ early childhood issue.
Depends on the nature of the disability. This would be ideal.
Need both.
The primary focus of health will be ...
This will be a major activity area, but not primary focus.

Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
124 Assessment will no longer be focused on determination of eligibility for special education services but will be used primarily as an ongoing part of instructional planning.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.64 SD=1.36 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.24 SD=1.17 N=114	
Comments on Item 124: This may be the most important single thing to accomplish! It would be lovely! Assessment will be used for both–therefore, I don't know how to answer the question. Still important to have a way to target resources to (a) those "most in need academically" (the educational deficit), and (b) to people with disabilities BEFORE any deficit occurs. This would leave no way to protect the integrity of the special education funding stream.			
125 Eligibility criteria for special education services will be performance-based, not numerically based as in currently used discrepancy formulas.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.74 SD=1.31 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.16 SD=1.16 N=114	
Comments on Item 125: If you mean the LD discrepancy models, can them! However, performance deficits are only one aspect of what signals the need for sp. ed. Note, a discrepancy formula is only used for ONE category now–very desirable.			
126 States will be able to appropriate sufficient resources to provide early intervention services (birth to 3) for children who need them (those with disabilities and at-risk for educational problems).	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.68 SD=1.60 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.69 SD=0.79 N=114	
Comments on Item 126: Very desirable, but over the years, funds have been cut first at the early levels. It is becoming higher priority (e.g., Pres. B's generous support of Head Start). Hopefully birth to 21. I hope it will occur, but not too likely.			

Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
127 As appropriate, students with disabilities will be included on IEP development teams to represent their own interests and desires for educational services.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.96 SD=1.32 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.11 SD=1.13 N=114	

Comments on Item 127:
Parents must also serve.
If appropriate for individual. child.
Highly dependent on age of the child and disability.
Should be now–the law allows for it.
Differs with age levels. Parents often reduce participation at secondary level. It seems that they lack influence with their child at that time or avoid conflict.
If age or ability appropriate.
They are now if appropriate.
They are often now when possible and appropriate.
This is not necessary as a change–done 80% of time now.
In majority of cases but not all...
This should be the practice as students get older. They should have a say in their educational program.
Depends upon age of student.
Desirability depends on student's age and ability.
all age levels? for some students this would be appropriate.
Especially students in secondary ed.
They already are allowed/ encouraged by law.
More likely to happen for older students, but important/ desirable for all.
As appropriate–desirable.
as age appropriate-very desirable.
They are now.
Is common practice in some schools now.
It's already happening.
At what age?
Depends on age and level of severity.

Predictive Statement	Likelihood	Desirability	Additional Comments
128 Community service agencies (health care, mental health, social services) will deliver their services in neighborhoods.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.88 SD=1.29 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.47 SD=0.72 N=115	

Comments on Item 128:
I'm not sure that "neighborhoods" are geographic any more as much as social and related to work.
Or at least school will be the point of access–very desirable.

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
129 Funding models will support the provision of special education and other services in the neighborhood school, provide interaction with age appropriate peers, and participation in the local community.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.17 SD=1.15 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.50 SD=0.85 N=115	
Comments on Item 129: Again for most not all. Does now in many states.			
130 Transition and postschool planning for students with disabilities will begin at the elementary level instead of during adolescence.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.86 SD=1.30 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.29 SD=1.02 N=115	
Comments on Item 130: Question desirability–My concern with this is that we not make judgements about students too early and limit their exposure to the general ed. curriculum. Americans still view this as tracking and will not "buy in" at that early an age. Should begin at home before they start school. Transition is present since the infant and toddler program.			
131 Statutory and fiscal reform will occur in states that will drastically reduce interagency barriers and constraints to transition from school to work for individuals with disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.60 SD=1.44 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.57 SD=0.69 N=115	
Comments on Item 131: It would require lots of change and rethinking–respect for each discipline area, but it would be very desirable. Closing military bases is easier! If this happened in 20 years, it would be a miracle!			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
132 Business will commonly fund training for individuals with disabilities to overcome barriers to employability.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.17 SD=1.33 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.42 SD=0.84 N=115	
Comments on Item 132: Will happen only if labor shortage is so great that they have no choice. Maybe through private/ public partnerships, but businesses are in the business of making money; if doing this is cheaper for them, they'll do it, but I doubt that it will save them $'s. Business needs change too quickly–will we educate for only a single specific outcome? Not without some funding incentive.			
133 Technological advances in information storage and retrieval will enable parents and educators to access one data source ~~to plan~~ about services and materials needed to serve individuals with disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.92 SD=1.42 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.23 SD=1.08 N=115	
Comments on Item 133: Potential is there–likely and desirable. Will have to be provided-...funded–is there a large ...market? Information does not assure programs that meet needs. We know now so much more than we are willing to put into practice. Highly desirable–but no more likely than agency redesign. As long as it relates to needs of individuals, it would be likely and desirable. Low likelihood if based on one data source, but high likelihood (if many data sources).			

<table>
<tr><th>Predictive Statement</th><th>Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)</th><th>Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)</th><th>Additional Comments</th></tr>
<tr><td>134a Improvements in the quality of instruction for students and collaborative efforts by school staff will eliminate the need for special education services for students with mild disabilities <u>(excluding students with sensory impairments)</u>.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=3.73
SD=1.41
N=115</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=5.48
SD=1.87
N=115</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Comments on Item 134:
If student needs are really being met and not just thrown into the mainstream–very desirable.
The option for sp. ed. service should not be eliminated.
Controversial!
Need for support for student and staff
Critically important–very likely and desirable.
Concept is good, but doubtful. It is not an either/ or situation but a cooperative management means.
Not eliminate, but certainly alter and refocus.
Disagree with second part of statement.
Again, mixing mild and moderate confuses the issue.
? "will" might
The name may change from "spec. ed." but I think we'll still need special efforts (not just "good regular teachers") for this population.
[Services] will be eliminated but not because of real improvements.
It should reduce the need.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>134b Improvements in the quality of instruction for students and collaborative efforts by school staff will eliminate the need for special education services for students with moderate disabilities <u>(excluding students with sensory impairments)</u>.</td><td>Unlikely Likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=
SD=
N=</td><td>Undesirable Desirable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
X=
SD=
N=</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
135 Improvements in the quality of instruction for students and collaborative efforts by school staff will eliminate the need for special education services for students with **severe** disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=2.45 SD=1.24 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.95 SD=1.83 N=115	
Comments on Item 135: The option for sp. ed. service should not be eliminated. Not feasible. Would be great, but not realistic. Disagree with second part of statement. Age level issues again come into play. "Some" not all of the needs. As stated earlier, we will still need some special programs. Not realistic. The need for additional funds will not likely change, whoever provides the service.			
136 Compliance, access, and inclusion will no longer be satisfactory measures of the effectiveness of special education.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.89 SD=1.47 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.96 SD=1.53 N=113	
Comments on Item 136: Assuming we get beyond those barriers–very desirable. Are they now? Are they now? Student learning will! Satisfaction, yes–complete, no. Great to get beyond these issues–very desirable.			
137 Special education will be held accountable for a high level of quality in programs for students with exceptional needs and improved outcomes resulting from services provided.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.20 SD=1.19 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.28 SD=1.07 N=114	
Comments on Item 137: Does this mean without any other staff involvement (D=no response)? This should NOT be just a sp. ed. endeavor, thus the score given (4's). I hope so. I hope someone is held accountable! Why do we keep talking like there are two systems? Can't we just have one? Limitations as to what anyone can do with some students and/ or families.			

Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
138 Educational funding barriers will be removed by changes in law and regulations so that education services to students with disabilities can be financed from multiple sources.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.67 SD=1.36 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.42 SD=0.94 N=115	
Comments on Item 138: Critical. Will be movement, but probably not ...within 20 years. They can now–I don't understand this statement. Already is occurring.			
139 Equitable residential, social, and community adult life options will be available to virtually all individuals with disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.78 SD=1.77 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.71 SD=0.62 N=115	
Comments on Item 139: We are so far behind, it will take more than 20 years. This is not an education problem it's a social problem. $'s. Such funding will not be available.			
N37 The borderline between special and regular education's responsibilities will become increasingly obscure.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
140 Productive and integrated employment in a competitive work environment will be accepted as a realistic goal for individuals, including those with severe disabilities.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.36 SD=1.41 N=113	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.27 SD=1.02 N=113	
Comments on Item 140: Need more research data to substantiate the severe disability portion of this item. How about creating cooperative work environments? If competitive edge is the cut, people with severe disabilities will suffer. Will be espoused but not available. Will this make employment the only goal? Not all severely involved.			

Predictive Statement	Likelihood: What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	Desirability: Should this change occur? (Circle One)	Additional Comments
141 ~~IEPs~~ Individual service plans developed by multiagency teams will replace IEPs and will include not only skill/instructional objectives, but will also include community supports needed by the individual student and his or her family.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.25 SD=1.15 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.38 SD=1.01 N=114	
Comments on Item 141: –Schools will serve as case managers–very likely and desirable. Funding needs to be addressed first. IEPs developed by multiagency teams will include... The supports are needed, but schools (IEPs) may not be the mechanism. Depends on funding patterns. Ed. not now responsible for community supports (i.e., respite).			
142 Efforts to improve education will include ~~be shifted to first~~ solving the ills of society (i.e., inadequate health care, lack of low cost housing, increasing violence and crime, full employment, and poor nutrition).	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.63 SD=1.65 N=111	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.07 SD=1.93 N=112	
Comments on Item 142: If those problems were solved, school problems would be more manageable. Desirability tempered by the fact that education can influence the other area more that vice versa. We need to address both areas. Not likely, but we can dream. Not realistic. Changes in society go hand-in-hand with changes in society. Not sure of the meaning of this item. Not shifted, but concurrent effort. "Not shifted to," but will include... Let's solve education's problems with educational efforts! Regardless of the "inputs" to the system and the "context" in which we function, our job must be to increase skills and abilities. Fuzzy–Education is a process, the outcomes of which depend significantly on these other things. I'm not sure what the statement means. Using "first" creates a sequential scenario rather than allowing for multidimensional approach. Education is a viable solution, too! If that's the case then throw out the likelihood part of this unless you extend the time period beyond 20 years. Societal ills must also be solved in tandem with educational improvements.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
143 Education will become an activity of private enterprise rather than a public service.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=3.01 SD=1.35 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=2.43 SD=1.56 N=114	
Comments on Item 143: Positive if it means more students will ultimately be prepared for the workplace. We talk about government intervention in health care at the same time we talk about privatizing education. The private sector is greedy. Profit is the motive not the well being of society. I only say this is desirable because of our past history of not changing will doom us. Needs to be both. The data are clear here. Private schools are not better at teaching. Their advantages are smaller classes and more supportive families–not better instruction. Provocative statement!			
144 Alternative curriculum options will be developed for students for whom the standard curriculum is not appropriate.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.23 SD=1.18 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.23 SD=1.10 N=115	
Comments on Item 144: Isn't that special education? Again, age level is critical. We finally may have to accept the fact that differences are real. Wonderful!			
145 Due to rising costs, litigation, and residential placements for children with disabilities, a backlash reaction to expenditures will severely limit spending on special education services.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.58 SD=1.30 N=115	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.84 SD=1.30 N=115	
Comments on Item 145: The backlash has already happened. I think sp. ed. is now institutionalized and essentially secure. Somewhere, someone will bear the costs. This might be desirable because it will force us to re-think our systems. Certainly within individual states–it's already happening in my state.			

Predictive Statement	**Likelihood:** What is the likelihood this change will occur in the next 20 years? (Circle One)	**Desirability:** Should this change occur? (Circle One)	**Additional Comments**
146 Due to the medical services and technology needed to serve medically involved students, the costs of special education will double.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.96 SD=1.40 N=114	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=2.35 SD=1.55 N=113	
Comments on Item 146: This statement does not seem to be one for which response options are appropriate. Highly desirable if it means quality services, but not highly desirable to double cost of special education. At least double! No, I think ...will begin more equitable practice..via 99-457 and isolated forces. Depends on national health insurance – we need, at minimum, MEDICARE for children from inception to age 18. Appropriately delivered this need not be so! It would be undesirable to double the cost, yet not undesirable to deliver the best education possible. Quality is what counts! These costs should not be borne solely by sp. ed. Don't have a clue. The cost of everything is doubling! Not doubled overall. Don't think so–technology becomes less costly as it develops–not very likely.			
N38 OT and PT will no longer be legal guarantees of special education.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=5.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=6.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
N39 Related service [personnel] shortages will increase significantly.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
N40 Costs for related services will increase significantly.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=1.0 SD=0.0 N=1	
N41 The ambiguity among medical, related services, and instructional services will have increasing fiscal implications.	Unlikely Likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=7.0 SD=0.0 N=1	Undesirable Desirable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X=4.0 SD=0.0 N=1	